

No 5573.149

172-176



GIVEN BY

U. S. Sup't of Documents



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

PUBLICATION NO 173

PUBLIC CHILD-CARING WORK IN
CERTAIN COUNTIES OF MINNESOTA
NORTH CAROLINA, *and* NEW YORK

5575-149





U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JAMES J. DAVIS, Secretary

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

GRACE ABBOTT, Chief

PUBLIC CHILD-CARING WORK
IN CERTAIN COUNTIES OF MINNESOTA
NORTH CAROLINA, *and* NEW YORK

By

H. IDA CURRY



Bureau Publication No. 173



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON

1927

SINGLE COPIES
OF THE PUBLICATION MAY BE OBTAINED UPON
APPLICATION TO THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU
ADDITIONAL COPIES MAY BE PROCURED FROM
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
AT
15 CENTS PER COPY

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Purpose and scope of the study.....	1
Summary.....	2
The system in Minnesota.....	2
The system in North Carolina.....	3
The system in Dutchess County, N. Y.....	4
Comparison of the three systems.....	5
Conclusions.....	6
Public child-caring work in Minnesota.....	8
Child care prior to 1917.....	8
The State board of control.....	9
The Minnesota Children's Bureau.....	10
County boards of child welfare.....	11
Outstanding features of the Minnesota system.....	14
Activities of the Minnesota Children's Bureau.....	15
Supervision of maternity homes.....	15
Protection of unmarried mothers.....	16
Prosecutions for carnal knowledge.....	24
Care of dependent and neglected children.....	24
Juvenile courts.....	29
Assistance in regard to mothers' allowances.....	30
Administration of relief funds to the poor and to prisoners' families.....	32
Public child-caring work in North Carolina.....	33
Child care prior to 1917.....	33
Adoption of a State and county system.....	34
The State board of charities and public welfare.....	34
County boards of public welfare.....	35
County superintendents of public welfare.....	36
The county as the unit of administration.....	39
Outstanding features of the North Carolina system.....	40
Activities of county boards and county superintendents.....	41
Protection of unmarried mothers.....	41
Care of dependent and neglected children.....	42
Juvenile courts.....	42
Investigations for mothers' allowances.....	43
Administration of general poor relief.....	44
Promotion of school attendance.....	45
Assistance to the State child-welfare commission in regard to child labor.....	47
Supervision of children on parole from State institutions.....	48
Related State welfare programs.....	48
Development of good roads.....	48
Establishment of consolidated schools.....	49
County health programs.....	49
Public child-caring work in Dutchess County, N. Y.....	51
Child care prior to 1917.....	51
Development of a centralized system.....	52
The board of child welfare.....	53
Outstanding features of the Dutchess County system.....	56
Activities of the Dutchess County board of child welfare.....	56
Care of dependent and neglected children.....	57
Assistance to the children's court.....	58
Administration of mothers' allowances.....	58
Cost of the work.....	59
Similar programs in other counties.....	59
Appendixes:	
A.—Summary of data obtained in nine counties in Minnesota.....	60
B.—Summary of data obtained in three counties in North Carolina.....	80

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, February 28, 1927.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a report on public child-caring work in certain counties of Minnesota, North Carolina, and New York.

Because the adoption of the county as the unit for child-welfare activities is under consideration in many States, it has seemed worth while to supplement the brief description of county-wide child-welfare programs published in 1922 by a closer study of the work actually being done in the States in which broad programs are in operation, and in one in which the county program is restricted to care for needy children. Through the cooperation of the State Charities Aid Association of New York the bureau was able to secure the services of H. Ida Curry, the association's superintendent of county children's agencies, for the field investigation and the preparation of this report. The Children's Bureau is also indebted to the director of the children's bureau of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, the Commissioner of Public Welfare, North Carolina, and the Superintendent of the Dutchess County Board of Child Welfare for assistance in this study.

Respectfully submitted.

GRACE ABBOTT, *Chief.*

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor.

PUBLIC CHILD-CARING WORK IN CERTAIN COUNTIES OF MINNESOTA, NORTH CAROLINA, AND NEW YORK

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

In recent years there have been much discussion and speculation as to the possibilities of effective county organization for child care, and an increasing number of experiments in this direction have been made in the various States. An impetus was given this movement when at the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1915 the chairman of the children's committee made a report¹ in which he analyzed the types of service to children that should be provided in every community and suggested a method for organizing such service. The plan suggested in this report was very much like that adopted by Minnesota in 1917.

As county programs appeared to be developing rapidly the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor published in 1922 a brief description of the county systems that have been developed in Minnesota, North Carolina, California, and New Jersey, and in selected counties of New York.² Because the system is under consideration in many States it has seemed worth while to make a closer study of what is being done for and with children in need of special care in the States in which county systems are operated most widely. The States selected for study were North Carolina, whose program operates in each of the 100 counties, and Minnesota, whose program had reached 74 of the 87 counties by the end of 1924. The system in Dutchess County, N. Y., is presented to illustrate a more restricted but a definite county program to care for needy children. All these three forms of organization were adopted in 1917.

The information given in this report relates for the most part to the year 1924.

The law and its administration in each State were examined to ascertain what legal provisions had been made for meeting the problems of destitute, neglected, delinquent, and defective children, and to what extent the agencies which had been established were finding such children and ministering to their needs. The counties visited in each State were selected by the administrators of the State boards as representative of what had been accomplished so far. State and county officials were interviewed, and from one day to a week was spent with the different county executives by the representative of the U. S. Children's Bureau in an endeavor to ascertain exactly what

¹ Carstens, C. C.: "A community plan in children's work." Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, 1915, pp. 92-103. Chicago, 1915.

² County Organization for Child Care and Protection. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 107. Washington, 1922.

was happening to children through such county organizations for child welfare as were in operation.

As these studies were to be of public provision for child care, the work of private child-caring organizations was noted only as they were brought to attention by reason of their relation to the public agencies. No attempt was made to estimate the relative value of their programs, the extent to which they were supplementing those of the public agencies, nor the degree in which they were supporting or serving children for whom the public agencies might provide under existing laws if adequate appropriations could be secured.

SUMMARY

THE SYSTEM IN MINNESOTA

In Minnesota the State board of control may receive as wards of the State children committed to its care by courts. It is the guardian of all children in State institutions. It is responsible for the welfare of all children of illegitimate birth and for seeing that paternity is established and support secured for them. It is its duty to promote the enforcement of all laws for the protection of illegitimate, dependent, neglected, delinquent, and defective children (and also the blind, the deaf, and the feeble-minded. It licenses and inspects boarding homes; supervises and passes on the fitness of child-placing and child-helping agencies; visits each foster home in which a child is placed by any agency; and ascertains the condition and antecedents of the child and the suitability of the home before legal adoption is granted by the court. To exercise these duties the State board of control in 1917³ established a State children's bureau. The board of control through the State school for dependent children—but not as yet through its children's bureau—places children on apprenticeship or for adoption. Mothers' aid is granted by the juvenile courts, but the children's bureau of the State board of control is charged to promote efficiency and uniformity of administration, and to advise and cooperate with the courts in relation to such aid.

Minnesota has provided for county boards of child welfare but confines their duties to the welfare of needy children, and does not extend them to matters of education and health. Each board is composed of three citizens (five in cities of the first class) selected by the State board of control who act with two elected county officials, and it performs such duties in its own territory as are required by the State board of control, whose agent it is. Upon request it may assist the juvenile court in the investigation and supervision of mothers' allowances and may also assist the board of county commissioners or the supervisors of the various towns in the administration of outdoor relief. Although the county boards were created to perform the duties of the State board within the respective counties, only a majority of their members are subject to the control of the State board. Frequently the official members of the boards are among the most active and interested members. However, embarrassment might result should an occasion arise wherein the State board of control desired its county representatives to exert pressure for the improvement of county administration.

³ Minn., act of Apr. 10, 1917, Laws of 1917, ch. 194, sec. 1, p. 279 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 4454, p. 638).

Minnesota presents an outstanding experiment of State responsibility administered largely through county units. A county child-welfare board may employ an executive secretary and other assistants when funds are appropriated therefor by the county. Usually the executive secretary becomes responsible for all social case work, reporting to the local child-welfare board. Where no secretary is employed the case work is distributed among the members of the county board, who are guided by the field representative of the children's bureau of the State board of control. So far the chief work of the county boards and of their executive secretaries has been establishing paternity and securing support for children of illegitimate birth, assisting juvenile courts in the administration of mothers' allowances, and visiting families in which children have been placed or which wish to adopt children. Minnesota is trying the use of volunteer members of its county boards in case work on a large scale. It is securing desirable protection for children of illegitimate birth to a degree nowhere else approached. It has practically abolished "baby farms" and uncontrolled maternity homes. Responsibility, however, is divided among the State board of control and the county child-welfare board as the State's agent (with or without an executive secretary), the juvenile court, and the county commissioners. The county child-caring program therefore is not entirely centralized in Minnesota.

THE SYSTEM IN NORTH CAROLINA

In North Carolina the State board of charities and public welfare does not assume guardianship of children. It is empowered to investigate and to supervise, to study the problems, and to promote the welfare of children; to inspect and to license institutions and agencies; to inform the public as to social conditions and remedies for social ills; to recommend legislation; and to encourage counties to employ full-time county superintendents of public welfare. Primary responsibility for the care of individual children is left with the county. More recently the State board has assumed its only administrative duty dealing directly with case-work problems. A State appropriation provides for paying one-half the allowances to mothers, which are granted by boards of county commissioners. To guard the expenditure of State funds the State board requires certain case-work standards in the issuing of each allowance, and its representative considers the circumstances of each mother to whom an allowance is granted.

The State board of charities and public welfare appoints a county board of public welfare, consisting of three persons, to represent it in the counties. This county board is the agent of the State board and is authorized to perform such advisory and supervisory duties as may be imposed on it by the State board.

North Carolina legislation is unique in approaching the child-caring problem largely from the standpoint of education. The county-welfare program seeks primarily to get children to school, but it is more or less combined with the long-existing provision for the care of the poor by the board of county commissioners and is definitely linked with the county juvenile court.

North Carolina provides that every county shall have a county superintendent of public welfare, who in smaller counties may be the

county superintendent of schools and in other counties is appointed by the county board of education and board of county commissioners in joint session. The superintendent of welfare in North Carolina is primarily chief attendance officer for the schools, but he is also chief probation officer in the juvenile court. The superintendent—not the county-welfare board as agent of the State board of public welfare—has the duty of administering measures for the care and protection of the individual children. In Minnesota the State board of control through its children's bureau is responsible for case work; in North Carolina case work remains a county function.

With the schools, the juvenile court, a department of health, and public relief already organized on a county basis, and more closely coordinated than is usual in most States, it was possible in North Carolina to introduce a county-welfare agency to perform duties relating to all of them. With an adequate staff—which no county as yet possesses—the plan would appear to be entirely workable and capable of operating with a minimum of lost motion. Responsibility is definitely placed, and though the duties of the county superintendent of public welfare are numerous, they are but different phases of the problem of providing suitable relief for children who are in any kind of trouble and of promoting certain preventive measures.

In North Carolina the major part of the time of superintendents of public welfare is given to eliminating the causes of nonattendance at school and to giving probation service, but their other responsibilities are far-reaching. The North Carolina county program is more nearly centralized, as far as child welfare is concerned, than is that of Minnesota.

There is a wide divergence in the duties performed by the executive secretaries of the county child-welfare boards in Minnesota and the duties of the county superintendents of welfare in North Carolina (and also in the duties of such officers in the different counties of each State). Yet potentially both are officially responsible for investigating the circumstances of all children in need of special care or protection and for securing such measures of relief as are possible.

In neither State, however, may the State board, the county boards, or the county executives do more than recommend that support be given to a poor child. Only the boards of county commissioners, or in some counties of Minnesota the supervisors of the towns, can authorize the expenditure of public funds for such support. Private agencies in both States assumed the care of some children. In Minnesota the State school received those to be placed in foster homes, but in both States the county or town officials seemed reluctant to spend public money for the support of poor children outside their own homes. This attitude is laudable when the child's distress can be relieved through aid to mothers in their own homes, but for children requiring support outside their homes neither the public nor the private agencies fully met the need in either State.

THE SYSTEM IN DUTCHESS COUNTY, N. Y.

In contrast to the county programs of Minnesota and North Carolina is the experiment of Dutchess County, N. Y. The Dutchess County board of child welfare was established by special legislation as an agency solely for the public administration of care and protection to

children. The legislation, therefore, is much narrower in its application than either the Minnesota or the North Carolina measure, but the duties of the board are clear-cut. The county board of child welfare is required to provide suitably for destitute, neglected, and defective children, and for such delinquent children as may be committed to it by the children's court. Except when children are committed by the children's court to institutions as delinquents, the county board of child welfare alone can determine what children may be supported publicly either by aid to mothers or by boarding or institutional care.

The Dutchess County law is a development of the ancient provisions that the poor must be supported by taxation. Inspection, licensing of agencies, and all similar functions are left to the State board of charities. Probation is left to the court and school attendance to the educational authorities. The advantage of this system is that a socialized public agency determining the needs of children by case work is authorized to administer the public funds available for their relief. County or town officials in New York have long recognized the necessity of accepting poor children as public charges, even if they are loath to spend tax money for their support. County children's agencies in New York have been developed primarily to assist county officials in caring for children who are to be supported publicly.

COMPARISON OF THE THREE SYSTEMS

Although the same problems exist everywhere, a wide variety of conditions and traditions make identical programs in the various States inadvisable if not impossible. Each of the three States studied has made distinct contributions in child-caring methods, yet probably none of the systems could or should be copied exactly by any other State. The three systems offer widely divergent methods of dealing with their common problems.

The relation of the State board (by whatever name known) to the county board differs in the three States. In Minnesota the State board becomes the guardian of children and carries direct social case work responsibilities. In North Carolina and New York the State boards perform neither of these duties except as the North Carolina board expends State funds for mothers' aid. These two State boards stimulate and inspect work in the county, which carries the social case work responsibility. In New York a state-wide private agency has assisted in developing the county system, whereas in Minnesota and North Carolina the impetus has been wholly official.

The duties of the county boards in the three States vary widely. In Minnesota and New York the county boards are boards of child welfare. In North Carolina they are boards of public welfare, with much wider responsibilities. In Minnesota the boards perform the general duties of the State board of control and the specific duty of exercising guardianship for the State board. Upon request they may assist the court in administering mothers' aid and the commissioners in administering outdoor relief. In North Carolina the county board's duties are those assigned by the State board; and it also passes upon mothers' aid cases. In New York the duties of the county board are limited to the care of destitute, neglected, defective, and delinquent children.

As to administration the county boards in Minnesota and North Carolina were created to assist the State board in performing its duties within the county. In New York the county board was created to perform duties heretofore carried by county officials.

County executives in Minnesota are employed by the county child-welfare board and theoretically perform the duties of the State board, except as they are requested to assist county juvenile courts or county commissioners. In North Carolina the executives are employed by county officials to perform duties resting on the county and not on the State. They have a cooperative relation to the county welfare boards which locally represent the State. The executive in North Carolina has a wide variety of duties extending outside the realm of child welfare but including school attendance, probation, care and supervision of the poor, and oversight of dependent and delinquent children. In New York the executive is employed to do the field work of the county board, which carries the duties of the county to its children.

All three States support State schools for delinquent children and certain groups of defective children. Minnesota supports normal dependent children in a State school until they can be placed in free foster homes. For other children placed under guardianship of the State there is at present no special provision for support.⁴ In North Carolina and New York the State supports no normal dependent children. In all three States the poor laws permit such support from county or town funds, but only in New York have appropriations by counties been made widely for that purpose. In Minnesota and North Carolina private agencies assume the support of a number of these children. In New York the county generally pays the private institution a per capita rate for their board.

In granting mothers' allowances there are three different types of administration. In Minnesota the county juvenile courts and in North Carolina the county commissioners grant the allowances. Upon request the county child-welfare boards or their executives in each State may assist. In both States the law provides that half the allowances shall be paid by the State and half by the county (but the legislature in Minnesota has made no appropriation for the purpose). In North Carolina the allowance must be approved by the county welfare board representing the State board. In Dutchess County the board of child welfare grants the allowances, which are paid entirely by the county.

CONCLUSIONS

The differences in the situations in the three States emphasize the necessity for those interested in improving public programs of child care to provide adequately for the treatment of social needs as well as for their discovery. In planning State and county child-caring programs those interested have apparently too often failed to take into account that money for the support of children will be necessary to carry their programs into effect. Where this money is to come from, what bodies are to make such appropriations, the responsibility and the relation of the appropriating and the administrative

⁴In Minnesota the law of 1925 divided the support between the State and the county from which the children are committed (see footnote 4, p. 9).

bodies are questions that require careful consideration whenever child-caring legislation is contemplated.

Whether the State or county becomes the case-working unit, provision should be made for the various forms of treatment that the situation demands. If the State supports some children and the county supports others the divided financial responsibility is apt to result in an attempt by each to shift the burden of support to the other, whether or not the type of care meets the requirements of the child. If the State maintains a State school pending free-home placement and makes provision for no other form of support the frequent result is the permanent separation of children from parents who are in merely temporary need. Courts and local administrators are too inclined to separate children permanently from their families even if they have not the added inducement of free care in a State school as against the cost of local support for even a short time.

Similar difficulties may arise in counties where the town system of support prevails. If delinquent children become county or State charges there is a tendency to have them committed to a State school as delinquents if more suitable treatment would involve the expenditure of town funds.

If the State is to carry responsibility for case work, and especially if it is to accept children as its wards, it should make sufficiently large appropriations not only to cover the salary and expenses of an adequate number of social workers to make the investigations upon which treatment of the various needs of the children must be based, but also to pay for the various types of treatment for which it becomes responsible.⁵

Except perhaps in compact States of small area it seems unlikely that legislatures will be willing to appropriate sufficient funds for these two purposes. Unless a State board can be provided with such funds the practicability of the State's accepting case-work responsibility should be weighed carefully against the plan of developing such State supervision, licensing, and inspection as will insure an acceptable standard of case work on the part of its lesser subdivisions, the counties. On the other hand, if the county is determined upon as the practicable unit for support, it should provide socially trained agents to conduct its case work, and it also should support needy children who require either assistance within the family or temporary care outside the family until they can be returned to their own homes or placed elsewhere on a permanent basis.

Children in Minnesota, North Carolina, and New York are faring far better under the ministrations of the county child-welfare boards herein described than before such boards were created. The administrators in all three States have encountered difficulties, but each has made a definite contribution in the field of public child-caring administration. A closer analysis of their methods and of the results of their work is presented in the following pages.

⁵ An interesting demonstration of the service that can be rendered when appropriations permit adequate personnel is being made in North Carolina under a grant of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund. (See footnote 12, p. 40, of this report.)

PUBLIC CHILD-CARING WORK IN MINNESOTA

CHILD CARE PRIOR TO 1917

Minnesota was one of the earlier States to appoint a commission to study its laws relating to child welfare.¹ In 1917 this commission made a report to the legislature, and its main recommendations were enacted into law. Prior to that year the State board of control had practically no responsibility in regard to socially handicapped children. The board was not authorized to see that needy children were protected or supported by public agencies nor that an acceptable type of care was afforded them by the private child-caring agencies then existing. It had supervision and some degree of control over such State institutions as existed for the care of delinquent and defective minors and also over the State public school for dependent children, to which a limited number of children were sent under the provisions of the general statutes of 1913, as is indicated in the following extracts:

When a minor becomes chargeable upon any county the county board (the board of county commissioners) shall secure his admission to the State public school or provide a home for him with some respectable householder, if one can be found who will take him.

* * * * *

When any minor becomes chargeable upon any town, city, or village for support the board or council or a member thereof shall apply to the county board to secure his admission to the State public school or secure him a home with some respectable householder if one can be found who will take him.²

The law did not say what should be done for a child who could not be sent to the State school when no "respectable householder" was found willing to take him. The general provision for the care of the poor is as follows:

When any such poor person has none of the relatives named in section 3067, or they are not of sufficient ability, or refuse, or fail to support him, he shall receive such support or relief as the case may require from the county, town, city, or village in which he has a settlement at the time of applying therefor, as herein-after provided.³

Under this provision there would seem to have been no legal obstacle to the support of needy children either in their own homes or elsewhere, although such support was seldom given. There was practically no recognition on the part of local authorities of any obligation to support poor children.

In Minnesota in 58 of the 87 counties the unit of poor-law administration was the county, and in the others it was the township. In recent years certain counties have shifted from the county to the town system. Where the town system is in force the town board or the city council is responsible for the care of the poor, and where the

¹State Commissions for the Study and Revision of Child-Welfare Laws, p. 49. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 131. Washington, 1924.

²Minn., Gen. Stat. 1913, secs. 3085, 3096 (3), pp. 679, 681 (Gen. Stat. 1923, secs. 3175, 3186 (3), pp. 447, 448).

³Ibid., sec. 3069, p. 676 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 3159, p. 445).

county system prevails the board of county commissioners is responsible. The support of poor children, however, seldom has been considered a local obligation. Only small doles of home relief ordinarily have been given, and some towns over long periods of time have incurred no expense for the support of any poor person in an almshouse or elsewhere.

Before 1917 comparatively few children in the State outside the largest three cities received any care or support through either a public or a private agency except the limited number benefited by mothers' allowances.⁴

THE STATE BOARD OF CONTROL

The Minnesota State Board of Control consists of three full-time paid members (one of whom must be a woman) appointed by the governor for terms of six years. The board has the following duties with respect to child care and protection:

The State board of control shall have powers of legal guardianship over the persons of all children who may be committed by court of competent jurisdiction to the care of the board or to institutions under its management. After commitment to its guardianship the board may make such provision for and disposition of the child as necessity and the best interests of the child may from time to time require: *Provided, however*, That no child shall be placed in an institution maintained for the care of delinquents who has not been duly adjudged to be delinquent: *And provided further*, That the board shall not be authorized to consent to the adoption of a child who is committed to its guardianship on account of delinquency.

It shall be the duty of the board of control when notified of a woman who is delivered of an illegitimate child, or pregnant with child likely to be illegitimate when born, to take care that the interests of the child are safeguarded, that appropriate steps are taken to establish his paternity, and that there is secured for him the nearest possible approximation to the care, support, and education that he would be entitled to if born of lawful marriage. For the better accomplishment of these purposes the board may initiate such legal or other action as is deemed necessary; may make such provision for the care, maintenance, and education of the child as the best interest of the child may from time to time require; and may offer its aid and protection in such ways as are found wise and expedient to the unmarried woman approaching motherhood.

It shall be the duty of the board to promote the enforcement of all laws for the protection of defective, illegitimate, dependent, neglected, and delinquent children, to cooperate to this end with juvenile courts and all reputable child-helping and child-placing agencies of a public or private character, and to take the initiative in all matters involving the interests of such children where adequate provision therefor has not already been made. The board shall have authority to appoint and fix the salaries of a child-executive officer and such assistants as shall be deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.⁵

The board of control is the guardian of all children in the institutions under its management, having the exclusive management of the State training school for boys and girls, the school for the feeble-minded, the State hospital, asylums for the deaf, the State public

⁴ Since this report was written a law has been enacted authorizing the State board of control to receive children who because of some handicap could not be sent to the State school for free-home placement and providing that the State should pay one-half of the cost of their support, the county committing the child to pay the other half. (Minn., act of Apr. 22, 1925, ch. 303, Laws of 1925, p. 384.) An attempt to obtain a State appropriation in 1925 to cover one-half the support of children committed to the State board of control, the other half to be chargeable to the county or town in which the various children so committed had poor-law settlements, was not successful. Such appropriation would develop a recognition of local responsibility for the support of the relatively large number among the children in every community who require temporary support during a period of family misfortune or who because of some physical or mental handicap are not considered placeable in family homes.

⁵ Minn. act of Apr. 10, 1917, Laws of 1917, ch. 194, p. 279, secs. 1, 2, and 3 (Gen. Stat. 1923, secs. 4454, 4455, 4456, p. 638).

school for dependent children, the State hospitals for indigent, crippled, and deformed children and consumptives, the home for girls, and the State reformatory for women. The board is required to manage the various State institutions for boys and girls; to look after the interests of the blind and give special attention to the blind and deaf in ways specified; to cooperate with the administration of relief to the poor, upon requests of boards of county commissioners or of the town boards or other public boards or bodies; to supervise and license maternity homes and boarding homes; to supervise and pass on the fitness of child-placing and child-helping organizations and to visit each home into which a child has been placed; and to investigate the condition and antecedents of the child and the suitability of the home when petition is made for legal adoption.⁶

THE MINNESOTA CHILDREN'S BUREAU

As authorized by the law of 1917 the Minnesota State Board of Control organized within itself a children's bureau to administer the new laws protecting children. This bureau therefore is responsible for all administrative detail in organizing county boards and in guiding and supervising them, exercising guardianship over children made wards of the State, protecting the welfare of children born out of wedlock, licensing and supervising maternity hospitals and child-caring institutions and agencies, supervising child placing, certifying or licensing boarding homes, and making the investigations required before legal adoptions are granted. Apparently for practical rather than theoretical reasons the State children's bureau was given no degree of responsibility for, or authority over, the State school or its child placing.

Some courts have taken advantage of the law permitting the board of control to act as guardian of any child committed to it by a court. Since 1918 approximately 100 children were said to have been so committed to the State board of control. Many of these children were "difficult" but in the opinion of the judges not "bad enough" to be sent to State reform schools. The others were destitute and neglected. No support for these children could be got from State funds nor from county funds. A commitment by a court does not presuppose public support unless the commitment is to a State institution. The removal of guardianship has been a stimulus to parents so that some of these children were later restored to their homes; others were sent to the State school; and still others were provided for by private child-caring agencies.⁷

The State children's bureau has a department for the feeble-minded, through which the State board of control exercises guardianship over the feeble-minded persons committed to its care, divided roughly into three groups—those requiring supervision outside institutions, those awaiting admission to suitable institutions, and those needing further observation before classification. Since 1917 the courts had committed 1,801 persons as feeble-minded to the guardianship of the State

⁶ Minn., Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 4401, p. 632.

⁷ One child committed to the State board of control three years before the study had been placed in several families. One child was found to be insane. Four boys 13 to 15 years old were committed to the board of control as a gang. Two of these were put under supervision in their own homes, one was placed at first with an uncle and later with a sister in Minneapolis, and the fourth was placed in a family in that city. For State guardianship of such children the law clearly provides. For their support no such clear provision is made.

board of control. In 1923 a department for the blind was created as a part of the State children's bureau. The field and employment agency of the State school for the blind was abolished, and the annual appropriation of \$4,000, formerly made for it, was transferred to the State board of control to further "the education, advisement, training, placement, and conservation of the blind."⁸ The placing of these departments under the State children's bureau indicates a tendency toward developing the bureau into a bureau of public welfare, as has been advocated by certain social workers in Minnesota.

At no time since its organization has the State children's bureau been staffed adequately. In 1924 it employed a director, a case supervisor, six district representatives, a supervisor of institutions, a supervisor for the feeble-minded, and a field worker for the feeble-minded. This list does not include the workers for the blind nor the clerical force.⁹ The legislature of 1925 appropriated \$50,000 for the State children's bureau, \$10,000 more than the preceding year's appropriation.

COUNTY BOARDS OF CHILD WELFARE

As has been stated, the law provided that the State board of control, either directly or through the children's bureau, should be definitely responsible for children in all parts of the State and provided for the creation of county boards of child welfare to represent the State board of control in its administrative functions within the various counties.

A county board of child welfare was to be organized only upon the request of the board of county commissioners. It was to consist of three members appointed by the State board of control (except in counties containing first-class cities, in which five members were to be appointed by this board), together with the superintendent of schools and one member of the board of county commissioners to be named by that body. The members were to serve without compensation, and the board was to perform such duties as might be required of it by the State board of control.

The superintendent of schools and the county commissioners are elective local officials, so that these two of the five members (of the seven members in the larger counties) of the county boards of child welfare can hardly be under the same degree of obligation to represent the State as are the appointed members. It was believed that this official representation on the county board made the local officials more likely to understand the work and therefore made more probable the obtaining of adequate local appropriations for the county work. However, it is conceivable that this minority of officials may tend to hamper the State board of control on occasions by making it more difficult to utilize the county welfare boards as instruments to correct local abuses or weaknesses in local administration.

In appointing county-board members the State board selected prominent and public-spirited citizens who were willing to give time to the tasks to be undertaken. Frequently the activity of a county

⁸ Minn., act of Apr. 19, 1923, ch. 336, sec. 1 (f), Laws of 1923, p. 487; Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, p. 37.

⁹ In 1926 the staff of the State children's bureau consisted of a director, an assistant director (who also acted as case supervisor), a case assistant, six district representatives, a supervisor of institutions and agencies, a field worker for the department of institutions and agencies, a supervisor for the feeble-minded, a field examiner who was also mental examiner for the feeble-minded, a supervisor for the blind, a field worker for the blind, and a field teacher of the blind. This list does not include the clerical force.

board depends almost wholly on the interest and leadership of some one of its members. The members of the county boards have not the training or skill of the field representatives of the State children's bureau; hence they are largely dependent on the State representatives for guidance.

In counties where no executive secretary was employed the burden of clerical work which devolved upon a county board, particularly upon its secretary, was soon apparent. Increasingly the county superintendents of schools, who usually had some stenographic service, were being named as secretaries of the county-welfare boards. In 1924 out of a total of 73 boards there were 24 county boards of which the superintendent of schools was secretary, 10 boards of which he was chairman, and 5 of which he was vice chairman. County commissioners were chairmen of 16 boards.

The county board, through its members or its executive secretary, is expected to perform the duties of the State board in relation to establishing paternity and conserving the welfare of children born out of wedlock, in the investigations for the licensing of boarding homes and of maternity hospitals, in the investigations of foster families in which children have been placed, in the investigations required before legal adoptions are granted by the courts, and in the supervision of such children and feeble-minded persons as have been committed to the guardianship of the State board of control. Upon request of the court they may investigate applications for mother's allowances and supervise families receiving allowances. Upon request they also may cooperate with the public officials or boards charged with the relief of the poor.

The budgets of the county boards of child welfare for the fiscal year 1924-25 show the widest possible variation from no funds at all with which to meet even postage or telephone calls to \$33,000 in Hennepin County (in which Minneapolis is located), \$25,000 in Ramsey County (in which St. Paul is located), and \$15,000 in St. Louis County (in which Duluth is located). One county with a full-time executive secretary appropriates \$2,500; another appropriates \$1,500 and the American Red Cross contributes \$1,500; still another appropriates \$1,500 for all expenses. Salaries vary in the rural field, \$1,800 being the highest and \$900 the lowest for full-time service.

Each county board of child welfare is authorized to appoint an executive secretary and all necessary assistants, who receive from the county such salaries as may be fixed by the child-welfare board with the approval of the county board of commissioners. Persons thus appointed are the executive agents of the child-welfare board.

No specific qualifications for executive secretaries have been formulated, but the State board has encouraged the appointment of secretaries who have had definite training for social work or some experience in social case work. Although the executive secretary is paid by the county authorities he represents a county board appointed to perform duties assigned by the State board of control. Hence the executive secretary is paid by the county to perform the obligations of the State within the county. In view of this status of the executive secretary a former director of the Minnesota Children's Bureau has suggested that it might be desirable that the State pay some part of the salary of county executive officers.

The law provides that the juvenile-court judge or the board of county commissioners, in a county where no welfare board exists, may appoint an agent to cooperate with the State board in furthering the purposes of the act. Two counties have availed themselves of this provision. However, the State children's bureau is inclined to discourage the appointment of such agents, as it believes that better results may be expected from the creation of county boards of child welfare.

That the trend of public opinion is in the general direction of developing child-welfare boards into general public-welfare boards was indicated by an enactment of 1921 providing that any city or village council, board of county commissioners, or town board might employ public-health nurses, and that boards of county commissioners might "detail any such public-health nurses to act under the direction of the county superintendent of schools, the county welfare board, or the county health officer."¹⁰ In a few counties nurses are directed by the county boards of child welfare, and in one of the counties visited by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau the nursing work recently had been separated from the child-welfare board.

In the summer of 1924 county boards of child welfare had been organized in 74 of the 87 counties of the State at the request of boards of county commissioners. During the war period and immediately following, the American Red Cross contributed toward the salaries of executive secretaries in a number of counties or donated part of the time of their secretaries or of their nurses, who were designated executive secretaries. In the autumn of 1924 there were among the 74 counties 9 that had full-time executive secretaries; 3 had executive secretaries who gave part time to the American Red Cross; and 6 had part-time executive secretaries. In two counties the county nurse acted as executive secretary. The remaining 54 counties had no paid worker. In two of the 13 counties having no boards of child welfare there were agents appointed by the juvenile court; thus there remained 11 counties having no service to children.¹¹

For the purposes of administration the State has been divided into six districts, each under the supervision of a paid representative of the children's bureau of the State board of control. Each representative covers 14 or 15 counties, including about 14,000 square miles. Where an executive secretary is employed by a county child-welfare board all tasks except the inspection of agencies and institutions are referred to her and the field representative of the State bureau exercises only general supervision except in emergencies. Otherwise the field representative guides the county boards of child welfare as best she can in the limited time at her disposal. In counties without boards the field representative attempts to do the most emergent work. The difficulties of the task are apparent, but the system is comparatively new and appropriations have been meager.

¹⁰ Minn., act of Feb. 27, 1919, ch. 38, Laws of 1919, p. 35, as amended by act of Mar. 31, 1921, ch. 138, Laws of 1921, p. 192.

¹¹ In 1926 there were child-welfare boards in 80 counties. In 20 of these counties executive secretaries were employed—four giving part-time service only. Three of the 16 full-time executive secretaries were county nurses acting in that capacity, and 3 others were paid entirely or partly by the American Red Cross. Two counties that had no boards of child welfare employed agents appointed by the juvenile court. Thus there were but five counties having no service to children.

OUTSTANDING FEATURES OF THE MINNESOTA SYSTEM

Among the outstanding features of the Minnesota system may be noted the following:

1. Administrative as well as supervisory responsibility for the care and protection of children throughout the State has been given to the State, its administrative duties being exercised through county boards of child welfare appointed for the purpose.

2. The State becomes the actual guardian of the person of children committed to State institutions of any kind, of such other children as may be committed to it by the courts, and of all feeble-minded persons.

3. County boards of child welfare composed of citizens designated by the State board of control together with the two local elected officials perform the duties of the State board within the various counties.

4. The State is made responsible for the welfare of all children born out of wedlock. The protection of these children through proceedings to establish paternity and the collection and disbursement of support funds have been pressed with great vigor and with tangible results.

5. The State is required to visit every home in which a child has been placed and to license all agencies which do any child placing. It is also required to make suitable inquiry before a legal adoption may be granted by any court in the State.

6. Minnesota is experimenting on a large scale in the use of volunteers in the field of social service. The volunteer members of these county boards, particularly where no executive secretary is employed, are handling the intricate problems related to unmarried mothers, child placing, adoptions, and mothers' allowances.

7. Because of inadequate facilities the State board of control and its county boards have been unable to perform all the duties placed upon them.

The laws are based on a desire to centralize responsibility in the State board of control and to decentralize administration by appointing county boards of child welfare to represent the State body. The evident intention is to make the State and not its subdivisions responsible for the welfare of children requiring care outside their own homes. In theory, any child needing support is to be provided for in one of three ways: (1) Through an allowance to his mother from county funds, (2) by transfer of guardianship to the State board of control through commitment to the State school for placement in a foster home or to a State institution for delinquents or defectives, or (3) by direct commitment to the State board of control.

The practical difficulties observed in this study in 1924 were that appropriations for mothers' allowances were not sufficient to relieve all destitute children who might benefit thereby, that the children of families not eligible for allowances were likely to be separated permanently from their people and sent to the State school although local relief or boarding care might have tided over the difficulty, and that no provision had been made for the support of children committed to the board of control. Consequently a considerable number of children for whose support the State and county welfare boards

desired public funds were not relieved at all or were supported by private charitable agencies where such existed—almost exclusively in the large cities. (For examples of some difficulties that county boards of child welfare encountered see Appendix A, pp. 60–80.)

ACTIVITIES OF THE MINNESOTA CHILDREN'S BUREAU

The activities of the State children's bureau had consisted largely of supervision of maternity homes, work for the protection of unmarried mothers (including the obtaining of prosecutions for cases of carnal knowledge), and activities to promote the care of destitute and neglected children. Some work was done in relation to mothers' allowances. No special cooperation with juvenile courts was noted; in no county visited by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau had the court appointed either a member of the county board of child welfare or the executive secretary to act as probation officer. County boards of child welfare had assisted in administering relief funds in a few localities and also handled problems of prisoners' children. These activities are described in the following pages.

SUPERVISION OF MATERNITY HOMES

The Minnesota law stated clearly what should constitute a maternity home:

Any person who receives for care and treatment during pregnancy or during delivery or within 10 days after delivery more than one woman within a period of six months, except women related to him by blood or marriage, shall be deemed to maintain a maternity hospital. The word "person" where used in this act shall include individuals, partnerships, voluntary associations, and corporations: *Provided, however,* That this act shall not be construed to relate to any institution under the management of the State board of control or its officers or agent.¹²

Maternity hospitals must be licensed by the State board of control and are subject to its rules; and "no person, as an inducement to a woman to go to any maternity hospital during confinement, shall in any way offer to dispose of any child, or advertise that he will give children for adoption or hold himself out as being able to dispose of children in any manner."¹³

By diligently investigating all lying-in hospitals and baby farms reported as undesirable the State children's bureau believed it had practically eliminated all such places. In 1924 there were in the State 201 licensed maternity hospitals.

Maternity hospitals were required to report all births and deaths to the State board of control as well as to the State board of health.¹⁴ By joint rules these boards required that every baby born in a maternity hospital be nursed by his mother for three months unless the mother was physically unable to nurse him. Maternity hospitals are equipped to care for a certain proportion of the mothers through the entire three-month period. This requirement has been effective as an infant-welfare measure, and it has greatly furthered the work for unmarried mothers and their babies under the law of 1917 for which Minnesota has become so widely known. (See the following section.)

¹² Minn., act of Sept. 22, 1919, ch. 50, sec. 1, Laws of 1919 (extra session), p. 76 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 4550, p. 648).

¹³ *Ibid.*, sec. 2, Laws of 1919 (extra session), p. 77 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 4552, p. 648).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, sec. 5, Laws of 1919 (extra session), p. 77 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 4554, p. 648).

Without this control of maternity hospitals the law of 1917 in regard to illegitimate children doubtless would have been much more restricted in its influence.

PROTECTION OF UNMARRIED MOTHERS

Among the laws of 1917 none has received more attention throughout the country than the one designed to protect the interests of children of illegitimate birth.¹⁵ When the State children's bureau was organized it at once turned its attention to the enforcement of this provision. Through the reports received from maternity hospitals and from other sources the State children's bureau and the county boards of child welfare have been increasingly successful in obtaining knowledge of unmarried mothers, for the welfare of whose babies the State board of control has been made directly responsible.

Provisions of the law.

The main provisions of the law indicating the procedure necessary in the handling of these cases by the county boards of child welfare are as follows:

The mother may make complaint to a justice of the peace or a municipal court, which may issue a warrant made executable anywhere in the State. The complaint and further proceedings may be filed either in the county where the woman or the accused man resides or in the one where the child is found. When the accused man appears for a hearing the judge may exclude the general public, and on the request of either the man or woman he must do so.

The case is held for the district court if the evidence presents "probable cause to believe the defendant guilty." Pending his trial the man may plead guilty at any time. A jury trial is provided for. The law reads:

If he [the accused man] is found guilty, or admits the truth of the accusation, he shall be adjudged to be the father of such child and thenceforth shall be subject to all the obligations for the care, maintenance, and education of such child, and to all the penalties for failure to perform the same, which are or shall be imposed by law upon the father of a legitimate child of like age and capacity. Judgment shall also be entered against him for all expenses incurred by the county for the lying-in and support of and attendance upon the mother during her sickness, and for the care and support of such child prior to said judgment of paternity, the amount of which expenses, if any, shall also be found by the judge, together with the costs of prosecution.¹⁶

The court may order payment made to the State board of control, to the county board of child welfare, or to a duly appointed guardian of the child; and payment may be ordered made in a lump sum, or in specified sums each month, or on such other terms as the court may deem desirable for the protection of the child. The court may require bond or other security and may "order defendant to pay all expenses necessarily incurred by, or in behalf of, the mother of such child, in connection with her confinement and the care and maintenance of the child prior to judgment."

Operation of the law.

The law became operative on January 1, 1918. In the first six months thereafter 407 mothers were recorded. There were 1,827

¹⁵ Minn., act of Apr. 12, 1917, ch. 210, Laws of 1917, pp. 296-200. For later amendments see Minn., Gen. Stat. 1923, secs. 3261-3273, pp. 461-463.

¹⁶ Minn., Gen. Stat. 1913, sec. 3218, as amended by act of Apr. 23, 1921, ch. 489, Laws of 1921, p. 830 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 3265, p. 461).

recorded in the two years ended June 30, 1920; 2,714 in the two years ended June 30, 1922; and 2,894 in the two years ended June 30, 1924.¹⁷

The distinctive feature of this law was the responsibility of the State board of control in the matter of establishing paternity. The activity of the children's bureau of the State board and its stimulation of the county boards of child welfare brought about notable results. It was the opinion of the staff of the State children's bureau and of the county boards interviewed that one-third to one-half of the time of the entire State and local force was consumed in this branch of service. If it seems at first thought that more time has been allotted to this feature of the work than the proportion of children benefited might warrant, at least a valuable demonstration has been made which is worthy of study in other States.

The State children's bureau estimated that paternity had been established in 701 cases (approximately 14 per cent of all illegitimate births) during the two years ended June 30, 1924.

Not only poor, ignorant, and mentally defective unmarried mothers are reached by the Minnesota system but also a sufficiently large proportion of women from the educated and professional groups to lend color to the belief that the law is applying equally to all children born out of wedlock.

The previous occupations of the unmarried mothers were given as follows for the two years ended June 30, 1924:¹⁸

Occupation	Number of un-married mothers	Occupation	Number of un-married mothers
Total.....	4, 860	Teaching.....	102
Housework.....	1, 421	Nursing.....	36
Hotel and restaurant work.....	641	Other occupations.....	400
Factory work.....	351	No employment:	
Office work.....	322	At home.....	560
Clerical work.....	195	Students.....	357
Telephone operating.....	160	No occupation.....	32
		Not reported.....	283

Procedure.

Original information as to an unmarried mother or an unmarried pregnant girl or woman may come to the State board of control in various ways. A large number were reported from the maternity hospitals. Occasionally one was discovered when a mother applied for boarding or institutional care or for placement for her child. Local boards were learning of such cases increasingly as they were becoming better organized and better known. The mothers frequently appealed directly to the district attorneys, who in counties having welfare boards usually referred the cases to the boards for investigation.

The mother's statement was taken at as early a date as possible, but circumstances determined when the accused man should be interviewed. Usually it was considered best to await the birth of the baby before instituting proceedings, lest the man unceremoniously leave the State. The preliminary hearing was usually in chambers. A surprising number of the accused men acknowledged paternity when the law was explained to them. The case workers interviewed could

¹⁷ Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, p. 25.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

recall but one case where a man had been adjudged the father of a child wrongfully. (See p. 64.) On the other hand it was comparatively rare for an accused man persistently to hold that his relations with the girl had been entirely innocent, even when paternity was denied. It was stated that in the majority of instances the men acknowledged paternity before their cases were taken before the judge—either to the social worker or during the preliminary hearing.

The Minnesota experience seems an answer to the fear that a social handling of these cases will increase the possibility of blackmail in such cases.

As has been stated, the law provides that the court may require the father to pay a lump sum or a specified monthly amount to the State board of control, or the county child-welfare board, if there be one, or to the duly appointed guardian of the child. There is no uniformity in the counties in regard to these payments. The courts order payments made in all three ways, and also to the district attorney, to the father of the unmarried mother, and to the mother herself. At the time of the study it was impossible for the State board to know what sums had been collected for the support of these children with safeguarding whose welfare it is charged.

To protect these funds a social-welfare fund was established in 1923 as follows:

Except as hereinafter expressly provided otherwise, all moneys and funds now or hereafter held by the State board of control and the child-welfare boards of the several counties in trust or for the benefit of defective, illegitimate, dependent, neglected, and delinquent children, or persons feeble-minded, inebriate, or insane, or other wards or beneficiaries, under any law now or hereafter in force, shall be and the same hereby are constituted and made into a single fund to be known as the "social-welfare fund" which shall be deposited at interest, held, or disbursed as hereinafter provided.¹⁹

This act also provides for the investment at interest of such fund by the State treasurer and for its disbursement by the State board of control.

Although this careful provision is made to protect the funds held in trust by the State no similar provision requires the bonding of members of county child-welfare boards who may be holding or disbursing such funds. In the three larger counties the executive secretaries were bonded. The larger portion of funds in these counties was paid to the child-welfare boards and disbursed by them. However, lump-sum settlements and a portion of the monthly payments were paid to the State board of control.

Any system of bonding individual members of county child-welfare boards would be difficult and probably undesirable, yet a greater degree of protection should be provided if these funds are to be paid to and disbursed by agencies other than the State board of control. The children's bureau of the State board recognized the difficulty and was endeavoring to establish as rapidly as possible a more uniform practice throughout the State.

Court orders.

Usually court orders ranged from \$10 to \$30 a month, \$15 being the average sum fixed by the court. Settlements for lump sums were occasionally made when the father of the child was able to make a

¹⁹ Minn., act of Mar. 28, 1923, ch. 106, sec. 1, Laws of 1923, p. 97 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 4462, p. 638).

substantial cash payment. In numerous instances the court had ordered the father to take out an insurance policy of \$1,000 in favor of the child. Frequently the court also ordered confinement expenses paid. The sums fixed by the courts are illustrated by the following 10 instances, taken serially in July, 1924, from the records of men under court order to pay as filed in the office of the State children's bureau. In all these cases payments were made to the State board of control.

1. Man ordered in January, 1920, to pay \$1,000. \$10 a month is being paid regularly to the father of the girl.

2. Man ordered in February, 1920, to pay \$75 for confinement care, \$200 directly to the girl, and lump sum of \$700 to the State board of control. Monthly disbursements to support child are being made by the State board.

3. Man ordered in January, 1919, to pay \$1,000—\$450 in cash at once, \$550 in monthly installments. Payments of \$15 to \$100 have been made irregularly. In December, 1923, \$300 had been paid. Final payment was received in January, 1924, was \$30.

4. Man ordered in December, 1919, to pay \$187.45 for confinement expenses, to be paid as follows: \$25 in war stamps at market value, \$5 a month until a Liberty bond was paid up, when said bond was to be applied to expenses of confinement care, and \$15 a month thereafter. Last payment, received on June 30, 1924, was \$30.

5. Man ordered in July, 1920, to pay \$25 at once, \$10 on August 1, \$35 on September 1, \$30 a month up to and including July 1, 1921; \$20 on August 1, 1921; \$10 on September 1 and monthly thereafter, until child is 16 years of age. On January 1, 1923, the last payment was received. The man had paid ahead and the balance on hand in July, 1924, was \$98.38. Regular payments for the child's support have been made by the board of control.

6. Man ordered in September, 1919, to pay \$10 a month until child is 16 years of age. Payments have been more or less irregular. The last received was in May, 1923. The man was \$120 behind on July 1, 1924.

7. Man ordered in February, 1919, to pay \$15 a month until child is 16. Regular payments have been received to date.

8. Man ordered in June, 1919, to pay \$15 a month for first five years, and \$10 a month thereafter. Has been fairly regular, last payment received January, 1924.

9. Man paid in August, 1919, in cash \$100 for confinement care and \$1,200 for support.

10. Man (a brother of the girl) in June, 1919, paid \$500 for preconfinement and confinement care, and paid \$15 a month after birth of baby. Paid fairly well to June, 1922, then lapsed, but in May, 1924, he made three payments.

The receipt of lump-sum settlements ranging from \$500 to \$2,000 was noted. The average seemed to be from \$1,000 to \$2,000. Where the money collected by a court order was not required for the immediate support of the child it was invested and held to meet his future needs or to be turned over to him when he attained his majority.

Collection of payments.

Considerable difficulty was encountered in making monthly collection of payments. Payments were made irregularly, and some men who left the State ceased to pay. The State children's bureau kept individual accounts for all cases in which the payments were made to it. However, delays occurred in following up collections, and the overburdened field representatives frequently had to assume the task themselves or notify the county boards when men in their territory were in default. Only an increase of staff in the State children's bureau would make it possible for the county workers to be aware of the status of payments at all times. Because the State bureau had heavy work and a very small clerical staff it sometimes happened that a county representative was notified only when arrears of \$100

or more had accumulated, in which case collection was almost impossible.

The following table shows the sums received by the State board of control and paid into the welfare fund held by the State treasurer in the two years ended June 30, 1924: ²⁰

Funds transmitted to the State Board of Control of Minnesota by agencies receiving payments from fathers of children born out of wedlock, two years ended June 30, 1924

Agencies receiving payments	Number of children paid for	Sum paid	Average sum paid per child
Total	658	\$127, 608. 80	\$193. 93
State children's bureau	149	37, 154. 48	249. 35
County child-welfare boards.....	509	90, 454. 32	
Hennepin County.....	253	52, 476. 11	207. 41
Ramsey County.....	172	24, 390. 61	141. 80
St. Louis County.....	84	13, 587. 60	161. 75

This shows that the sums paid to the child-welfare boards in the smaller counties of the State averaged a higher per capita payment than those in any one of the counties that contain the larger cities; but this possibly may be due to lump-sum settlements, practically all of which would be included in the first group. The State children's bureau points out that statistics are not available to cover such settlements as were made in the various counties, which were not made payable to the State board of control.

The director of the State board of control has commented on this situation as follows:

In regard to the handling of trust funds for the support of illegitimate children, * * * our statute provides that the judge of the district court, before whom proceedings are pending, shall make and enter an order directing and requiring the father of such child to pay to the State board of control or the county child-welfare board, if there be one, or the duly appointed guardian of such child, such sum of money or its equivalent as may be proper and adequate for the care, maintenance, and education of such child. It is the policy of the board of control that all moneys are paid as provided by law [it does not always have the cooperation of the courts.] In some of the rural districts these judges have ordered the money for support of the child to be paid directly to the mother, who at times has been found to be feeble-minded; in some instances the money was ordered paid to the clerk of the district court, who handed it over to the mother in monthly allowances. The judge in defending this policy stated that he knew personally where the money went as the clerk of the court kept him informed. In some other instances the money has been paid to the county attorney or to some local official in whom the judge or county attorney has confidence. The children's bureau is steadily opposing this loose practice and is endeavoring to secure a uniform practice by the courts in having these moneys paid to the State board of control, especially where lump-sum settlements are made, or to the duly appointed guardian if the court sees fit to handle it in that manner, and where only monthly payments are made, as in the counties of Hennepin, Ramsey, and St. Louis, they are made to the child-welfare board in many instances. ²¹

One can but be impressed with the results obtained in the face of the almost insurmountable difficulties that accompanied the state-

²⁰ Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, p. 20.

²¹ Letter from Judge Charles F. Hall, Apr. 29, 1925.

wide administration of a new law involving case work. At the time of the visit of the agent of the United States Children's Bureau one field representative had a list of 492 unmarried mothers to be dealt with in her territory, which depended almost entirely upon the untrained volunteer service of members of the county boards of child welfare. This representative had visited cases 56 miles from any railroad. On the other hand the relative ease of establishing paternity was illustrated by the statement of a field representative who on one occasion had visited a rural county having no board of child welfare and had attended in four days to 11 cases of unmarried mothers, establishing paternity in each case, and had had one case of carnal knowledge prosecuted.

Aftercare of children born out of wedlock.

If the investigations before prosecution can not receive as much time and skill as would be desirable the aftercare can not be expected to be satisfactory. The field agents of the State children's bureau expressed their disappointment that so little could be done in following up the women and children who would benefit by more intensive social service. However, of 4,860 cases under observation in the two years ended June 30, 1924, the whereabouts of 4,080 children (83.9 per cent) were known; and deaths, stillbirths, and abortions were known to account for 431 (8.9 per cent). Information was lacking in regard to 349 cases (7.2 per cent).²² The whereabouts of these 4,080 children was as follows:

Whereabouts of children born out of wedlock in Minnesota, two years ended June 30, 1924.

Whereabouts	Children born out of wedlock	
	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	4,080	100
Family ties unbroken	3,006	74
Child with mother	2,675	66
Child with other relatives	331	8
Family ties broken, but restoration possible (child in boarding home)	506	12
Family ties broken	568	14
Child committed	185	5
Child adopted	317	8
Child placed by mother	66	2

Responsibility of the State and the county.

At no point does the relative responsibility for case-work detail and administration of the State versus the county raise so many questions as in regard to this work for unmarried mothers. Under such pressure as existed good case work on the part of the State representatives was quite impossible. The handling of these cases

²² Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, p. 26.

by members of the county boards was even less thorough than that by the State representatives, as they were entirely untrained save as experience gradually was giving them a knowledge of case-work possibilities. More finished work was seen in the better-equipped agencies in the counties containing the larger cities.

The State board of control transferred the detailed administration to county boards where they existed. This practice required a constant exchange of data between the State and county offices. It opened the way for the State to stimulate an ever-improving standard of case work in the counties, but it also created situations in which time-consuming correspondence back and forth had been of little apparent use. In all instances in which the county board through its members or its executive secretary acted as a representative of the State board a copy of all records and all correspondence in each case in theory was sent to the State children's bureau. Because of lack of secretarial assistance this rule was but irregularly observed, so that records in the State office were fragmentary although the policy was to have complete histories and records of each case in the State office.

Probably the details of administration and their results will need longer observation and study by the State children's bureau, with such modification as experience dictates from time to time, before a final conclusion can be formulated as to the soundness of the principle of having the State itself carry the case-work responsibility within the various counties.

Illustrative cases.

In some cases it was observed that procedure to secure support was followed almost mechanically even in very dissimilar situations. In one instance where a brother was responsible, apparently no action was taken except to establish paternity and to collect support.

A girl's father was responsible in one case. He was ordered to pay \$20 a month through a banker for the support of the baby. After this action was taken, a criminal charge was lodged, and the man was sent to the penitentiary. His children were scattered among relatives. He was still paying \$5 a month through the board of control to his daughter (who is now married).

In one instance a complication arose because the probate judge had acted as lawyer in a proceeding to establish paternity. Later when the baby was to be cared for the case came before him as juvenile-court judge.

Many instances were noted in which the fathers were under 18 years of age. It would have been possible to place them under the protection of the juvenile court for correction, but they were prosecuted in criminal court exactly as were the older offenders.

A complaint was lodged against a negro man in a case that had been reported as probably an illegitimate relationship, though the man and woman passed as husband and wife. It was found that the man had a wife living, from whom he was seeking a divorce. The mother of the baby desired to postpone entering the complaint until the outcome of the pending divorce was known. Complaint was filed June 3, 1924, and the man was ordered to pay \$30 a month from June 12. Although the baby had been born December 12, 1923, the first payment was made July 1, 1924. The man was paying as ordered, but

recently he had complained that the woman was quarrelsome and had on one occasion stabbed him in the arm. He protested that \$30 was an exorbitant payment in the circumstances.

The following case was cited to illustrate the care with which adjustments are made:

An unmarried mother had nursed her baby for three months and was devoted to it, but she did not desire to take it home as she was eager that no one should know she had given birth to it. The cooperation of a children's association was secured. The baby was boarded temporarily and the girl returned home without it. Shortly thereafter the county executive called at the home of the mother ostensibly to investigate it as a possible boarding home for a baby in whom the children's association was interested. Friends and neighbors were interviewed as to the suitability of the home for such purpose. It was found to be a high-grade home and was therefore licensed by the State board of control as a boarding home. The baby was sent to the home, ostensibly to board.

Policy of the State board of control.

The State board of control adopted on October 19, 1918, the following resolution, which is still operative:

Whereas chapter 194 of the general laws of 1917 places certain responsibilities upon the State board of control for the protection of illegitimate children, and

Whereas chapter 210 of the general laws of 1917 provides that the father of an illegitimate child shall be subject to the same responsibility as though the child were born to him in lawful wedlock.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the following statement of policy shall be adopted by the State board of control in making provision for the care and education of illegitimate children:

1. The State board of control will not be a party to any agreement for the mere purpose of releasing an action begun or threatened, by the payment of a small sum of money. There must be an admission of paternity and an agreement to assume full paternal responsibility. If the defendant or the prospective defendant denies his paternity, his remedy lies in a proper defense at the hearing in court, which hearings should always be held in private for the protection of all persons concerned.

2. The State board of control does not regard any man as wronged who has had relations with a girl at a time when he could be the father of a child born to her, if he is made to bear the paternal responsibility, even though other men have had relations with the girl at or about the same time. In such cases if the defendant refuses to assume responsibility, the interests of the child demand that a jury shall pass upon the question of paternity. Under such conditions the defendant will have full opportunity to establish his defense.

3. Because of the very large death rate among children born out of wedlock, the State board of control has ruled that such children must be nursed by their mothers for a period of at least three months, and as long thereafter as possible. There are properly equipped hospitals in the Twin Cities which will receive women for this full term of maternity care and afford the mother and child full protection as well as aid and assistance at a reasonable cost. The board has licensed a number of such hospitals and will furnish a list on application.

4. In making settlements, full consideration should be given to the circumstances of the defendant, but the standard should be that care which he would be able to give his children born in lawful wedlock. An infant can not be maintained properly on much less than \$20 a month, and the cost increases as the infant grows older.

5. If a lump-sum settlement is desired, the entire amount may be deposited with the State board of control as trustee, and any unexpended surplus returned, should the child die. A minimum lump-sum settlement should be in the neighborhood of \$3,000.

6. The question of adopting the child out with an approved family must abide the circumstances of the case. Adoption can not be considered until after the nursing period and then only if it seems necessary under all the circumstances.

7. All matters relating to illegitimacy should be treated confidentially, and all parties should be protected from unnecessary publicity. The child's interest is in all cases paramount.

PROSECUTIONS FOR CARNAL KNOWLEDGE

Parallel to the illegitimacy law and enforced with almost unvarying rigidity is the provision that—

Every person who shall carnally know and abuse any female child under the age of 18 years shall be punished as follows:

1. When such child is under the age of 10 years, by imprisonment in the State prison for life.
2. When such child is 10 and under the age of 14 years, by imprisonment in the State prison for not less than 7 nor more than 30 years.
3. When such child is 14 and under the age of 18 years, by imprisonment in the State prison for not more than 7 years, or by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than one year.²³

In the two years ended June 30, 1924, 111 criminal convictions were obtained, also 23 convictions in incest cases and 4 in rape cases.²⁴ Prosecutions for carnal knowledge were made regularly when a girl under 18 years of age was found to be pregnant, if the paternity of her child could be discovered.

The statutory provision prevents an accused man or boy from producing witnesses to testify that they had had similar relationships with the unmarried mother under 18 years of age, as frequently occurs in the courts of other States. In Minnesota it was observed that boys under 18 years of age were prosecuted exactly as were the men. No instance was cited of taking boys under 18 to the juvenile court for the kind of help such a court should give.

CARE OF DEPENDENT AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN

It was clear that in no county visited was anyone directly charged with the care of dependent and neglected children. The whole field of securing protection for neglected children was practically untouched except for children of illegitimate birth. There was a State humane society, and there were humane societies in two or three of the larger cities; but their work was not far-reaching. In one county the social workers were urging the establishment of a protective department in the county board of child welfare. In the rural counties the boards of child welfare occasionally brought neglect cases into the courts.

Representatives of private agencies stated that they constantly came across destitute and neglected children for whom no public provision was being made. In one territory the juvenile court frequently turned children over to a family-welfare agency when it did not know what else to do with them. So frequent were these commitments that one agency was forced to start a child-caring department and to undertake child placing, which in many respects was unsatisfactory and difficult to administer. However, the need was so acute that the family society planned to continue the work which was started to meet an emergency, and to place it on a higher basis of efficiency as a separate division of its organization.

The law specifically made it the duty of the State board of control to promote the enforcement of laws "for the protection of defective,

²³ Minn., Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 10125, p. 1396.

²⁴ Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, p. 26.

illegitimate, dependent, neglected, and delinquent children." But the protection of neglected children and the systematic work on behalf of destitute children who can not be helped by a mother's allowance have not yet become major functions of county child-welfare boards. Lack of funds for their support is one reason. County commissioners legally can support such children, but they were not inclined to do so.

The State board of control organized committees to formulate standards for the child-caring field, and in 1924 it adopted the minimum standards for boarding and permanent homes formulated by such a committee.²⁵ These standards were prepared by a conference group of which a former director of the children's bureau was chairman, and whose members represented both public and private child-caring agencies. The standards set forth that every child should be cared for in his own home whenever possible, and when this is impossible he should be carefully studied and the home in which he is to be placed should be investigated and then supervised as long as the child remains in it. The standards also recognize that many children need special types of boarding-home or temporary care. The committee expressed its belief in the wisdom of the Minnesota adoption law, which provides for investigation by the State children's bureau before a decree of adoption is entered, and it pledged its cooperation in the administration of this law.

Child placement in free homes.

The children's bureau of the State board of control had not undertaken to place children in foster homes. The child placing by the State was done by the State school for dependent children, which had five placing-out agents. This school (with a capacity of 370) received only children who were to be placed in free homes. The superintendent might decline to receive any child. No child under 1 year of age was accepted, and children having a syphilitic history or otherwise handicapped so that placement was thought to be impossible or unlikely might be refused or returned to the counties.

Placements by the State school are by law subject to inspection by the State board of control, but the children were not visited by the State children's bureau. There was a recognized weakness in administration at this point. The board of control is the guardian of children committed to the State school, and the law provides that the board shall find homes for them. When the laws of 1917 were enacted it seemed undesirable to change materially the methods of child placing which had long been followed by the State school, and the board took advantage of a provision permitting the superintendent of the institution to represent it in certain ways. Therefore the State children's bureau, which inspects and sets the standard for all other child-placing agencies, has no direct way of comparing its experiences and results with those of the State school.

The Minnesota law is drastic in its control of child placing by public or private organizations. It provides that—

No person other than the parents or relatives may assume the permanent care and custody of a child under 14 years of age unless authorized so to do by an order or decree of court. Except in proceedings for adoption, no parent may assign or otherwise transfer to another his rights or duties with respect

²⁵ Minimum standards for boarding and permanent homes, adopted by the State board of control Sept. 2, 1924. St. Paul, Minn.

to the permanent care and custody of his child under 14 years of age, and any such transfer hereafter made shall be void.

Whenever any person shall place a child in a private home for the purpose of providing the child with a permanent home, and whenever a child shall have been in such a home for a longer period than six months, the person responsible for the placing of the child shall immediately notify the State board of control, giving the name and address of the child, the name of the person with whom the child has been placed, with such other information regarding the child and his foster home as may be required by the board.

Within 90 days after the receipt of the notice provided for in section 3, the State board of control shall cause the child and the home in which he has been placed to be visited by its agents for the purpose of ascertaining whether the home is a suitable one for the child, and shall continue to visit and supervise the cause of such child the same as though the child were placed out by the State public school. Whenever satisfied that a child has been placed in an unsuitable home, the board may order its transfer, and if said order is not obeyed within 30 days or such shorter time as may be named in the order, the board itself shall take charge of and provide for such child.²⁶

A double precaution was taken. The State board of control passed upon the fitness of each agency to do child placing and in addition passed upon the suitability of each placement.

It shall be the duty of the State board of control to pass annually on the fitness of every agency, public, semipublic, or private, which engages in the business, for gain or otherwise, of receiving and caring for children or placing them in private homes. Annually at such time as the board shall direct every such agency shall make a report showing its condition, management, and competency to care adequately for such children as are or may be committed thereto or received thereby, the system of visitation employed for children placed in private homes, and such other facts as the board may require. When the board is satisfied that such agency is competent and has adequate facilities to care for such children, and that the requirements of the statutes covering the management of such agencies are being complied with, it shall issue to the same a certificate to that effect, which shall continue in force for one year unless sooner revoked by the board. A list of such certified agencies shall be sent by the board at least annually to all juvenile courts and to all the agencies so approved. No agency which has not received such a certificate within the 15 months next preceding, and which certificate remains unrevoked, shall receive a child for care or placing out, or place a child in another home, or solicit money in behalf of such agency. All such agencies shall be subject to the same visitation, inspection, and supervision by the State board of control as are the public charitable institutions of the State. For the purpose of this section the term agency means any individual, association, or corporation.²⁷

A number of the workers believed that the law might be so modified as to provide that the State board may (instead of shall) visit every home. It is believed that its power to withhold certificates to agencies falling below its standards is a sufficient safeguard to make visiting every home unnecessary. Other workers believed that only as each placement is visited can a suitable standard of child placing be insured. This revisiting and indeed reinvestigating by the agents of the State children's bureau led to criticism from the private agencies as involving an unnecessary waste of time and also as an unwarranted annoyance to the foster parents.

When volunteer county boards make investigations for the State board some difficulties arise. The wisdom of having so confidential an investigation made by a comparatively near neighbor may be questioned. Again, complications not conducive to the welfare of the child might occur when a volunteer board member is sent to check up the investigations of professional representatives of a certi-

²⁶ Minn., act of Sept. 22, 1919, ch. 51, secs. 2, 3, 4, Laws of 1919 (extra session), p. 80 (Gen. Stat. 1923, secs. 4561, 4562, 4563, p. 649).

²⁷ Ibid., sec. 8, Laws of 1919 (extra session), p. 81 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 4567, p. 650).

fied child-placing agency. This reinvestigation of foster homes consumes much of the time both of the field representatives of the State children's bureau and of the county boards and their representative secretaries. So long as the State children's bureau has little responsibility for the placements from the State school or for their supervision, and so long as its visitation of all other foster homes is delegated to some 70 county boards of child welfare, it will be difficult for the bureau to attain the highest practicable standards of child placing.

The number of cases handled during the two years ended June 30, 1924, was 700. This included 572 placement cases reported and 128 cases pending at the beginning of this biennial period. Members of the staff of the State children's bureau made 43 investigations of placements, and members of the boards of child welfare made the other investigations.²⁸

If the State board did not approve the placement the child must be removed; but usually a removal was arranged in conference with the placing agency, which voluntarily withdrew the child. Few formal disapprovals were recorded, although according to the statement of one field representative the various agencies had—upon the informal recommendation of the State children's bureau—removed a number of children from homes that were found to be undesirable.

The results of the investigations are indicated in the following data in regard to placements:²⁹

Disposition of reported placements	Number of children
Total	700
Placements approved ³⁰	435
Placements acted upon as adoption	34
Exportations approved	22
Placements disapproved ³¹	10
Placements withdrawn before action	58
Action pending	125
Miscellaneous	16

Among the 573 children involved in the placements³² were 247 of legitimate birth and 289 of illegitimate birth. The marital state of the parents of 37 children was not known. Among these children were 135 under 1 year of age, 235 between 1 and 5 years of age, and 175 who were 5 years of age or over. The ages of 28 children were not reported.

Occasionally a county welfare board or its executive found a suitable home for a child and placed him there temporarily. If the child had been committed to the State school, as is usually done, the school (representing the State board of control) assumed guardianship of the child, and the home was investigated and approved by the agent of the State school before the placement was considered permanent. The State school then became responsible for supervision.

²⁸ Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, pp. 20-22.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 21.

³⁰ Fifty-one of these children were placed with relatives.

³¹ Eight children were returned to the placing agency, and two were taken home by juvenile-court action.

³² There were 573 children involved in placement cases but only 572 were reported as placed in the biennial period covered by the report (Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, p. 20).

According to a ruling of the State children's bureau, when a child was placed in a family for temporary care without the payment of board, at the end of six months such placement must be considered permanent, and the regulations governing the placement of a child in a foster home must be complied with.

The immediate classification of a child as "placeable" or "unplaceable" seemed to present certain dangers. Too often the child was sent to the State school as placeable or was withheld as unplaceable solely because he was physically disabled or retarded, without due consideration of the actual necessity for permanent removal from his family. Attractive children sometimes were sent to the State school and then placed in homes for adoption when there seemed a reasonable possibility that they might have been returned to their own people later.

Supervision of boarding homes.

The law requires that every boarding home caring for three or more children under 3 years of age be licensed and that all other homes receiving children to board be certified by the State board of control. This requirement has been interpreted as covering every home in which a child is received for care, whether for gain or otherwise, if the child is not accompanied by the parent or guardian nor related to the foster parents. To meet this requirement the board of control had certified 12 child-caring agencies to inspect and supervise boarding homes. The State depended largely upon these agencies and the county boards of child welfare for all necessary work in connection with boarding homes. The staff of the State children's bureau made but 88 visits to boarding homes in two years.

During the two years ended June 30, 1924, 2,118 children were cared for in the 451 certified and 4 licensed boarding homes which were authorized to care for 809 at any given time. The average stay in a boarding home was between two and three months. Twenty homes failed to receive the certificate or license applied for; 9 applications were voluntarily withdrawn. One hundred and fifty-four formerly operating were closed (6 by court order) as a result of State inspection.³³

Inspection by volunteer county board members, where no trained service was available, for determining the suitability of homes for boarding care, as in the case of homes for free care, seemed fraught with difficulties.

Very few boarding homes were used for child placing by the county welfare boards, as funds for paying the boarding bills usually were not available.

Investigations preceding adoptions.

Another duty devolving upon the State board of control was that of making investigations before legal adoptions were granted by the court:

Upon the filing of a petition for the adoption of a minor child the court shall notify the State board of control. It shall then be the duty of the board to verify the allegations of the petition; to investigate the condition and antecedents of the child for the purpose of ascertaining whether he is a proper subject for adoption; and to make appropriate inquiry to determine whether the proposed foster home is a suitable home for the child. The board shall as soon as practicable

³³ Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, p. 32.

submit to the court a full report in writing, with a recommendation as to the granting of the petition and any other information regarding the child or the proposed home which the court shall require. No petition shall be granted until the child shall have lived for six months in the proposed home: *Provided, however*, That such investigation and period of residence may be waived by the court upon good cause shown, when satisfied that the proposed home and the child are suited to each other.³⁴

In the two years ended June 30, 1924, petitions for the adoption of 767 children were reported to the board of control. In 210 cases relatives desired to adopt; in 37 cases the relation of family and child was not reported; and in 520 cases the foster parents were not related to the children.

In 35 instances investigation was waived by the court. Eleven homes were disapproved; but in regard to one of these the recommendation of the State board was ignored and the adoption was granted by the court.

The law does not require six months' residence before the filing of a petition to adopt but only states that no petition shall be granted until such a length of time has elapsed unless the court waives the requirement. Furthermore, the law does not state that investigation is to be made at the end of the six-month trial residence. It requires a notice to the State board upon the filing of the petition and a report from the board "as soon as practicable." In practice the law was followed literally. For 373 of the adoptions the county welfare boards made investigations. The remaining 359 cases "were either investigated just previous to the filing of the petition, as placement cases, or were investigated directly by one of the field representatives of the [State] children's bureau."³⁵

As was stated by a staff member of the Minnesota children's bureau—

It is the practice of the children's bureau to make investigations on petitions for adoption as soon as convenient when the notices have been sent to the bureau. In many cases where the adoption is for a child that has previously been placed and an investigation made by the children's bureau, that investigation is usually taken for an investigation of the adoption unless a long time has elapsed and there may be certain circumstances that would suggest a second investigation. I may say we have not considered the making of an investigation at the end of six months as usually we have felt it wise to make an investigation as soon as possible in order that if the home were improper steps might be taken to remove the child.³⁶

The six-month period was generally considered a time in which investigations were to be made, and not a time to try out the probable desirability and permanency of the relationship between the child and the new parents.³⁷ It was reported that having the members of the county boards of child welfare make these investigations seemed to cause no especial difficulty.

JUVENILE COURTS

The Minnesota juvenile court law as amended in 1917³⁸ provides that in counties with a population of 33,000 inhabitants or more the

³⁴ Minn., act of Apr. 14, 1917, ch. 222, Laws of 1917, p. 335, amending Gen. Stat. 1913, sec. 7152 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 8625, p. 1182).

³⁵ Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, p. 24.

³⁶ Letter from Charles F. Hall, director of the Minnesota State Board of Control, Aug. 5, 1924.

³⁷ In regard to the law in other States concerning trial placement period see *Adoption Laws in the United States*, p. 20 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 148, Washington, 1925).

³⁸ Minn., Gen. Stat. 1913, secs. 7162-7164, pp. 1549-1550, as amended by act of Apr. 20, 1917, ch. 397, Laws of 1917, pp. 561-573.

district court shall be given original and exclusive jurisdiction over children under the age of 18 "coming within the terms of the act," judges to designate one of their number to act as juvenile-court judge. In counties with a population of less than 33,000 the probate judge was given certain duties in relation to children, which have been construed as limited to the constitutional jurisdiction of appointing a guardian.³⁹ In practice, however, there was little difference in the functioning of the two classes of juvenile courts.

The administration of the courts in both the larger and the smaller counties did not differ materially from that of such courts in other States in their dealing with delinquency, with serious neglect calling for a transfer of guardianship, or in regard to probation service; but there is provision in Minnesota for a more definite fixing of guardianship than is the case in certain other States, as in New York, for example.

The court is authorized to appoint "one or more persons of good character" to serve as probation officers. In no rural county visited had the court appointed either a member of the county board of child welfare or the executive secretary to act as probation officer. In the county containing a large city the court had a relatively large staff of probation officers whose work, including the investigation and supervision of mothers' allowances, was entirely independent of the board of child welfare.

ASSISTANCE IN REGARD TO MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES

Minnesota passed its first "mothers' pension act" in 1913, amending it materially in 1917.⁴⁰ The juvenile court is the agency in each county for the administration of these allowances, which may be granted in behalf of a child under 16 "who is not lawfully entitled to apply for and receive an employment certificate,"⁴¹ and whose mother is a widow, or has been left with the responsibility of support because her husband is in a penal institution (with certain reservations), in a hospital for the insane or State hospital for inebriates, or unable to labor to support his family by reason of physical disability, or is and for one year⁴² has been under indictment. It must be found that "the dependency of the child is due to the poverty of the mother without neglect, improvidence, or other fault on her part. Stipulations as to residence and fitness of the mother are made. Thus the way is opened for assisting in their own homes probably the vast majority of needy children.

The law provides that the court must make and file the findings in all these matters of fact concerning the mother and her circumstances, and that in counties of not less than 33,000 it is the duty of the county attorney⁴³ to investigate the financial condition and status

³⁹ Opinion of Attorney General, June 23, 1920. Report of Attorney General 1920, Opinion No. 327, p. 241.

⁴⁰ Minn., act of Mar. 27, 1913, ch. 130, Laws of 1913, p. 148, amended by act of Apr. 14, 1917, ch. 223, Laws of 1917, p. 337 (Gen. Stat. 1923, secs. 8671-8689, pp. 1188-1190). Further amendments were made in 1919, 1921, 1923, and 1925.

⁴¹ By an amendment in 1925 a child under 16 "who is regularly attending school, if physically able and of school age, or one who is under school age, or who through physical or mental disability is unable to be employed" is included (Minn., act of Apr. 24, 1925, ch. 355, Laws of 1925, p. 449).

⁴² The amendment of 1925 reduced this period to three months (Minn., act of Apr. 24, 1925, ch. 355, sec. 1, Laws of 1925, p. 449).

⁴³ These duties are also imposed upon the county commissioners by the 1925 amendment (Minn., act of Apr. 24, 1925, ch. 355, sec. 1, Laws of 1925, p. 449).

of the child or children and that of the mother, and to be present and give his evidence and information to the court.⁴⁴

In some of the smaller counties the probate judges were not lawyers, but the clerks of their courts frequently were. The curious situation was offered here that a lawyer was made responsible for a social investigation and for presenting his findings to a nonlawyer for judgment as to the desirability of relief and the amount thereof. As the majority of the probate courts had no probation service there was no case-work supervision of the families except where boards of child welfare were requested to assist the courts.

Though the law provided by amendment in 1917 that one-third of the amount granted to mothers should be paid by the State and two-thirds by the county, no appropriation for this purpose was made by the legislature in 1917, 1919, 1921, or 1923.⁴⁵

In the smaller counties the county attorney was the deciding factor in the granting of allowances to mothers. Frequently application was made first to him, and after inquiry he made a report to the court at the time of the formal hearing. Usually his recommendation was accepted by the court.

The State board of control is charged "to promote efficiency and uniformity in the administration" of the mothers' allowance act, and the law provided further that to this end it—

shall advise and cooperate with courts and shall supervise and direct county child-welfare boards with respect to methods of investigation, oversight and record-keeping; shall devise, recommend, and distribute blank forms; shall, by its agents, visit and inspect families to which allowances have been made; shall have access to all records and other data kept by courts and other agencies concerning such allowances; and may require such reports from clerks of the courts, child-welfare boards, probation officers, and other official investigators as it shall deem necessary.⁴⁶

Thus, although the court is entirely responsible for the granting of allowances and for securing such investigation and oversight as is satisfactory to itself, the board of control is given some responsibility for the work. As opportunity offers it may improve and standardize the administration in the different counties through supervision and advice.

As county boards of child welfare have been organized the rural judges generally have been glad to ask for assistance in the investigation of families seeking mothers' allowances, particularly in counties where executive secretaries are employed. A notable exception is in the larger counties, where the courts have developed their own staffs of assistants to handle the case-work problems of these mothers.

Some judges in the rural counties, who were seen by the agent of the United States Children's Bureau, expressed the opinion that the allowances might be administered more satisfactorily by the boards of child welfare. However, at least one judge was confident that only as a court fixed the expenditure of tax money after a judicial finding would the people of the community be satisfied, although he admitted that tax moneys were expended for all other charitable purposes without such findings by a court.

⁴⁴ Minn., act of Apr. 21, 1919, ch. 328, Laws of 1919, p. 349. By the amendment of 1925 (act of Apr. 24, 1925, ch. 353, Laws of 1925, p. 349) the county commissioners also must be notified.

⁴⁵ No appropriation was made in 1925.

⁴⁶ Minn., act of Apr. 14, 1917, ch. 223, sec. 12, Laws of 1917, p. 341 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 8683, p. 1190).

As the county board of child welfare acted only as an assistant to the court in the mothers' allowance cases, and the State board was not ultimately responsible, copies of records in these cases and of correspondence relating thereto were not sent to the State children's bureau as was done for the cases of unmarried mothers and all other cases for which the State board of control carries the ultimate responsibility.

In the rural counties visited it was not evident that the boards of child welfare had become dominant in this field. Their advice and recommendations were generally, although not always, followed. In the one county containing a large city which was visited the court was entirely independent of the board and of all other agencies in the administration of the allowances.

ADMINISTRATION OF RELIEF FUNDS TO THE POOR AND TO PRISONERS' FAMILIES

The county commissioners and the town boards of supervisors may ask the county boards of child welfare to assist in administering relief funds, but this has been done in only a few localities. In many towns almost no money was spent for the care of the poor. The State public school for dependent children returns to the counties children with a history of syphilis and the "high-grade morons." In many rural counties no money is available for their support, and generally no local provision is made for them.

When problems of prisoners' children were to be dealt with the local poor-law administrators usually were asked to give two-thirds of the needed relief; the State parole board furnished one-third from the prison fund—for the Minnesota prisons were more than self-supporting. The law was passed many years ago authorizing prison industries and permitting the earnings to be "used for the benefit of the prisoner, his family, or dependent relatives under such regulations as to time, manner, and amount of disbursements as the [State] board [of control] may prescribe."⁴⁷

This is of great assistance to county boards of child welfare in handling the cases of prisoners' children. The wages are paid to prisoners on a "piece-price system"⁴⁸ from the profit on goods sold, and the prisoners' earnings range from 25 cents to \$1.50 a day.

⁴⁷ Minn., act of Apr. 21, 1909, ch. 304, secs. 1 and 2, Laws of 1909, p. 353 (Gen. Stat. 1923, secs. 10820 and 10821, p. 1478).

⁴⁸ Minn., act of Apr. 12, 1895, ch. 154, sec. 4, Laws of 1895, p. 331 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 10810, p. 1476). Binder twine and farm machinery are the principal output. The sales of products amounted in 1918 to more than \$5,000,000. A modern new prison was built from the profits of the industries. Wages for the year ended June 30, 1924, amounted to \$118,808.92, and the sum paid to families of inmates was \$21,445.20 (Twelfth Biennial Report of the State Board of Control of Minnesota, period ended June 30, 1924, p. 144).

PUBLIC CHILD-CARING WORK IN NORTH CAROLINA

CHILD CARE PRIOR TO 1917

Before 1917 no one would have been likely to select North Carolina for a study of methods of reaching the problems of destitute, neglected, and delinquent children, or of school attendance. Fewer destitute children had been sent to county homes for the aged in recent years, but delinquents still could be found in the county homes in considerable numbers. A county usually sent destitute children to one of the private orphan asylums or to the North Carolina Children's Home Society for placement in family homes. The clerk of the superior court was authorized by law to "bind out" destitute children during minority, but this method of providing for homeless children had been generally discontinued. Children at too troublesome a stage of delinquency were brought into the justice's court, the city recorder's court, or the superior court. A boy convicted of the crime with which he was charged was sent to the chain gang to work on the roads and to live with the adult offenders in the road camps. A girl offender usually was sent to the almshouse.

The administration of public relief in each county of North Carolina was exclusively in the hands of the five members of the board of county commissioners. The main duty of these commissioners was, as in other States, to levy taxes and to make necessary appropriations. They were elected for that purpose primarily, and usually they had no aptitude for discovering or treating causes of pauperism.

All classes of poor were sent to local almshouses, which were called county homes for the aged and infirm. The insane, some short-time prisoners (especially women), and children were committed to the almshouses. No separation of sexes was contemplated, but the white people and the negroes were always provided with separate quarters.

Home relief by the county consisted of being put on the "outside list" for \$1 or \$2 or sometimes as high as \$3 a month. No other form of family relief was provided from public funds.

As there was no agency responsible for their protection and as the education law did not insure school attendance, neglected children were not brought to the attention of any public official interested in child life. Blind and lame children had nothing done for them, and the children most in need of the services of the county health officer were least likely to benefit by them.

Family-welfare agencies had been organized in some of the cities of the State. Church and private societies were helping as they could, but there was no state-wide public program for child protection. The problems of children in need of special care were little understood either by the officials or by the people of the various communities.

ADOPTION OF A STATE AND COUNTY SYSTEM

The adoption in 1917 of a state-wide system of public welfare including a broad but centralized and definite child-caring program with the county as the unit of administration introduced a new era in the protection of children in North Carolina. Because of the general interest in this scheme of administration it has attracted country-wide attention.

As the result of agitation initiated by the State Conference of Social Work there was passed in 1917 a law which enlarged the powers of the existing State board of charities and renamed it the State board of charities and public welfare.¹ The law also provided that the county commissioners of any county should have the right and power to create a county board of charities and public welfare and to employ a superintendent of public welfare. The three members of county boards were to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the State board, and no superintendent of public welfare was to be appointed who had not a certificate of qualifications from the State board. Slow progress was made in the counties under the permissive act.

In 1919 a juvenile court act was passed providing for a juvenile court in every county.² The appointment of county boards of public welfare and county superintendents of public welfare was made mandatory.³ By these significant amendments the members of the county boards thereafter were to be named by the State board of charities and public welfare instead of by the county commissioners, and the superintendent of welfare was to be appointed by the county commissioners and the county board of education jointly. Counties having a population of 25,000 or less were left free to carry on the work without employing a full-time superintendent by designating the county superintendent of public instruction to act as superintendent of public welfare. (In 1921 this was changed to counties having a population of 32,000.)⁴

The organization of the counties under this amended act began at once, and immediately many counties asked the legislature to pass special acts exempting them from the operation of the new law. Only one county secured exemption, however, and by another special act it almost immediately resumed work nearly identical with that provided for by the general statute. The system therefore is state-wide, reaching into each of the 100 counties.

THE STATE BOARD OF CHARITIES AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The law provides that the State board of charities and public welfare be composed of seven persons elected by the legislature upon recommendation of the governor, for terms of six years, two retiring every two years. The duties of this board are as follows:

1. To investigate and supervise, through and by its own members or its agents or employees, the whole system of the charitable and penal institutions of the State, and to recommend such changes and additional provisions as it may deem needful for their economical and efficient administration.

¹N. C., act of Mar. 6, 1917, ch. 170, Public Laws of 1917, pp. 320-324.

²N. C., Public Laws of 1919, ch. 97, secs. 1-26, pp. 243-254.

³N. C., act of Mar. 6, 1917, ch. 170, Public Laws of 1917, p. 320, as amended by act of Feb. 13, 1919, ch. 46, Public Laws of 1919, p. 69.

⁴N. C., act of Mar. 4, 1921, ch. 128, Public Laws of 1921, pp. 385-387.

2. To study the subjects of nonemployment, poverty, vagrancy, housing conditions, crime, public amusement, care and treatment of prisoners, divorce and wife desertion, the social evil and kindred subjects and their causes, treatment, and prevention, and the prevention of any hurtful social condition.

3. To study and promote the welfare of the dependant and delinquent child and to provide, either directly or through a bureau of the board, for the placing and supervision of dependant, delinquent, and defective children.

4. To inspect and make report on private orphanages, institutions, maternity homes, and persons or organizations receiving and placing children, and to require such institutions to submit such reports and information as the State board may determine.

5. To grant license for one year to such persons or agencies to carry on such work as it believes is needed and is for the public good, and is conducted by reputable persons or organizations, and to revoke such license when in its opinion the public welfare or the good of the children therein is not being properly subserved.

6. To issue bulletins and have same printed to such amount and extent as may be approved by the State printing commission and in other ways to inform the public as to social conditions and proper treatment and remedies for social evils.

7. To issue subpoenas and compel attendance of witnesses, administer oaths, and to send for persons and papers whenever it deems it necessary in making the investigations provided for herein or in the other discharge of its duties, and to give such publicity to its investigations and findings as it may deem best for the public welfare.

8. To employ a trained investigator of social-service problems who shall be known as the commissioner of public welfare, and to employ such other inspectors, officers, and agents as it may deem needful in the discharge of its duties.

9. To recommend to the legislature social legislation and the creation of necessary institutions.

10. To encourage employment by counties of the county superintendent of public welfare and to cooperate with the county superintendent of public welfare in every way possible.

11. To attend, either through its members or agents, social-service conventions and similar conventions, and to assist in promoting all helpful publicity tending to improve social conditions of the State, and to pay out of funds appropriated to the State board expenses, salaries of employees, and all other expenses incurred in carrying out the duties and powers hereinbefore set out.⁵

The office of the State board of charities and public welfare is inadequately equipped to carry the responsibilities resting upon it. At the time of the visit of the representative of the United States Children's Bureau the staff consisted of the commissioner, a county organizer, a field agent to inspect State and county charitable and penal institutions, an inspector of private child-caring agencies, and three office assistants. There were three consulting members—a psychopathologist, a psychologist, and a general expert. Although so inadequately staffed the board was doing effective work.⁶

COUNTY BOARDS OF PUBLIC WELFARE

The law provided for county boards of public welfare, each consisting of three members appointed by the State board of charities and public welfare, "to advise with and assist the State board in the work in the county, to make such visitations and reports as the State may request, and to act in a general advisory capacity to the county and municipal authorities in dealing with questions of dependency

⁵ N. C., Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 2), sec. 5066, pp. 96-97.

⁶ The organization of the executive staff as shown in more detail in the State board's biennial report was as follows: Commissioner of public welfare; director of the bureau of institutional supervision; director of mothers' aid and of case work, bureau of child welfare; director of the division of child-caring institutions, bureau of child welfare; director of the bureau of county organization; director of the bureau of mental health and hygiene; assistant to the director of mothers' aid; and a person in charge of promotion and publicity (Biennial Report of the North Carolina State Board of Charities and Public Welfare, July 1, 1922, to June 30, 1924, p. 4).

and delinquency, distribution of the poor funds, and social conditions generally."⁷

The State board of public welfare asked each county board of public welfare to meet on the Saturday preceding the first Monday of each month to consider all recommendations made by the superintendent of public welfare (whose duties are discussed in the following section of this report) and to approve or disapprove of them in writing. It urged the board in each county to accompany the county superintendent of public welfare to the meetings of the county boards of education and boards of county commissioners. Both these bodies meet on the first Monday in the month in the majority of the counties, if not in all of them. By a provision of the law of 1923 establishing allowances to mothers⁸ the county board of public welfare is required to pass upon each application for an allowance.

COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS OF PUBLIC WELFARE

As has been stated, the provision of the law regarding county superintendents of public welfare required that these officers be elected at a joint meeting of the board of county commissioners and the county board of education in the respective counties, and also that before assuming office the county superintendent of public welfare must have a certificate of qualifications from the State board of public welfare (see p. 34). The superintendent of public welfare was chief attendance officer of the county and had other powers and duties, as follows:

1. Under control of the county commissioners, the care and supervision of the poor and the administration of poor funds.
2. Acting as agent of the State board in relation to any work to be done by the State board within the county.
3. Under the direction of the State board, looking after and keeping up with the condition of persons discharged from hospitals for the insane and from other State institutions.
4. Oversight of prisoners in the county on parole from penitentiaries, reformatories, and all parole prisoners in the county.
5. Oversight of dependent and delinquent children, and especially those on parole or probation.
6. Oversight of all prisoners in the county on probation.
7. Promotion of wholesome recreation in the county and enforcement of such laws as regulate commercial amusement.
8. Under the direction of the State board, oversight over dependent children placed in the county by the State board.
9. Assisting the State board in finding employment for the unemployed.
10. Investigating into the cause of distress, under the direction of the State board, and such other investigations in the interest of social welfare as the State board may direct.⁹
11. As authorized agents of the State child-welfare commission, obtaining age certificates and issuing working permits under the laws and rules governing child labor.¹⁰

⁷ N. C., Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 2), sec. 5014, p. 99.

⁸ N. C., act of Feb. 26, 1923, ch. 260, Public Laws of 1923, p. 583.

⁹ N. C., Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 2), sec. 5017, p. 99.

¹⁰ Ibid., secs. 5034 and 5035, pp. 106-107.

It should be noted that in contrast to the county board of public welfare, which represents the State board of public welfare in its interest in local county administration and is authorized to act merely "in a general advisory capacity" in relation to actual administration within the county, the county superintendent of public welfare is a county officer, and he is not by law dependent upon the State board of public welfare in any way. He is responsible to the board of county commissioners and the county board of education who elected him—subject to certification of his qualifications by the State—and his duties relate primarily to the obligations of the county rather than to those of the State.

As it was recognized that the success of the county program would depend upon the qualifications of the local superintendent of welfare selected, the law provides that this official "shall be qualified by character, fitness, and experience to well discharge the duties" of the office, and, as has been mentioned, that "no one so elected shall begin the work of this position until he shall have received a certificate of approval of his fitness from the State board of charities and public welfare."

The wording of this section of the law has been criticized. It has been suggested that it would be better for the State board of public welfare to recommend names for appointment rather than to register approval or disapproval after a selection has been made by the county boards of commissioners and of education.

As an initial step in standardizing appointments the following rules have been issued by the State board of charities and public welfare:

1. The applicant should have at least a high-school education and preferably some college work.
2. He should be less than 45 years old unless he has had special training for social work.
3. He should be in good physical condition.
4. He should be tactful and sympathetic in dealing with people.
5. He should have shown some desire to do social work by having been actively interested in Red Cross work, church, charity, educational, or civic work, etc.
6. He should be of good moral character.
7. He should have the recommendation of the county board of charities and public welfare.
8. He should be willing to take the training provided each summer at the University of North Carolina by the school of public welfare of the university and the State board of charities and public welfare.¹¹

The duties of the county superintendent of public welfare may be recapitulated as follows: As chief probation officer he looked after the delinquent children; as an attendance officer he looked into the causes of unusual absences from the public schools; as investigator for the county commissioners he ascertained what families could and should be assisted from county funds, to what extent they should be

¹¹The Biennial Report of the North Carolina State Board of Charities and Public Welfare, July 1, 1922, to June 30, 1924, gives (p. 115) the following information concerning county superintendents of public welfare: There are 55 superintendents of public welfare in North Carolina. Of these 37 have attended college. 27 have college degrees, 32 have been teachers, and 3 are ministers. Their average age is 37 years plus, and 38 of them are married. There are 53 church members among them, and 47 are regular attendants at Sunday school. Some special community service, such as Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, Boy or Girl Scouts, parent-teacher association, health work, or men's, women's, or boys' clubs prior to their welfare work was reported by 29 of them. Fourteen have been in county welfare work since its organization in 1919.

helped and how; as investigator of applications for mother's allowances he recommended to the county board of public welfare the mothers and children who could best be helped in this way; as an assistant to the State officials he supervised children paroled from State institutions within the county; and as local representative of the State child-welfare commission he issued the permits for children to enter industry.

Only gradually did the county superintendents of public welfare comprehend the variety of duties that confronted them, and the complex problems that they were expected to meet. The State board of charities and public welfare stimulated the adoption of social case-work methods; institutes for county superintendents of public welfare were organized by the State university; and the State board refused to issue the required "certificate of approval of fitness" to county superintendents who were unsuited to the work. By training the superintendents in their various fields, by appointing superintendents of better training and of wider experience, and by systematizing and standardizing local work the State board had promoted the welfare program and made it increasingly effective. Each year had seen better work done, and the possibilities and usefulness of the system were being better understood by the workers themselves, by county officials, and by citizens throughout the State.

Not only was the busy county superintendent of welfare responsible for all these various types of child care, but he also was the person to decide whether the adult relatives of children need assistance either in or out of the home. He also had some degree of authority in regard to the county home, the county jails, and the road camps, and could influence the administration of these institutions, which directly and indirectly affect the child life of the community.

It seems obvious from the duties assigned to him that the county superintendent of public welfare should be a person of unusual ability. A representative member of one county board expressed the opinion that eventually the county superintendent of welfare should be given a rank equal to that now conceded to a county superintendent of public instruction; that he should be selected with the same careful consideration of qualifications and preparation for the work to be undertaken; and that he should be required to have had training for the field of social welfare comparable to that required in the educational field for the superintendent of public instruction.

As the welfare law provides that the work in the counties shall be supervised by the State board of charities and public welfare, the State board since January 1, 1924, has required monthly reports from the county superintendents of public welfare as one means of stimulating more uniform work.

The North Carolina system has been criticized for placing so wide a range of duties upon a single official. Without assistance no superintendent of welfare can reach more than a fraction of the children in need of some one of these forms of service in any one county. If an adequate staff of trained workers can be developed, however, this centralized system would seem to make it possible to give to each child the particular form of assistance he requires with a minimum expenditure of time, of effort, and of money.

THE COUNTY AS THE UNIT OF ADMINISTRATION

In North Carolina the county was the natural unit of administration in the newly organized welfare work, although cities were recognized as entitled to separate jurisdiction in certain of the general welfare measures. Public schools were on a county basis as far as administration was concerned, public health was on a county basis, and the poor relief was administered by county officials. It was therefore comparatively easy to organize a county welfare program.

In creating county boards of public welfare the State in a measure was returning to an earlier day. Until the middle of the nineteenth century there was in each county a court of wardens which administered both the "inside" and "outside" public relief to the poor, or—as it was called in many other States—"indoor" and "outdoor" relief. The position of warden was an honorable one and denoted the substantial character of the person who was thought worthy to be selected for this duty. Only men of outstanding ability and of unquestioned integrity could aspire to the office. Although the recently created boards of public welfare had not been made direct distributors of public relief, they too were composed of persons of outstanding integrity, and like the wardens of old their interest was specifically in the administration of public charity and correction. The fundamental idea in both instances seems to have been to bring together a group of representative citizens to consider the problems of the poor and to see that justice was done them.

North Carolina has 71 counties whose population is less than 32,000. In the majority of these smaller counties the county superintendent of public instruction became also the county superintendent of public welfare, as was permitted by the statute. (See p. 34.) He received no additional salary for the additional responsibility, but the law provided that the county should furnish him such clerical and other assistance as the board of county commissioners deems necessary to have the compulsory school attendance law fully enforced. An expense fund was also required. It is noteworthy that school attendance was singled out as of prime importance in the administration of the new law.

In the largest 29 counties full-time superintendents were required. As the enforcement of the compulsory school attendance law was looked upon as the main duty of the superintendents of public welfare, the commissioners in some of the counties thought that deputy sheriffs, policemen, and other agents of law enforcement were suitable appointees. In other counties successful superintendents of schools or teachers were appointed, and in still others persons with a general interest in children were selected. In a few counties a social worker already in the county or in some city therein was made superintendent for the county.

By the fall of 1924 there were part-time or full-time superintendents of welfare in 55 counties, including the 29 counties required by law to employ superintendents and 26 of the 71 counties permitted to appoint their superintendents of schools to the position. The organization was as follows in the 100 counties: Full-time superintendents of public welfare with assistants, 3 counties; full-time superintendents of public welfare without assistants, 42 counties; part-

time superintendents of public welfare, 10 counties; and the county superintendent of schools acting as superintendent of public welfare, 45. A six-week summer training course planned for county superintendents of welfare has been conducted for several years at the State university at Chapel Hill, N. C. The State board of charities and public welfare cooperates with the school of social welfare of the university in conducting the course. Since 1924 a willingness to attend this summer school has been one of the qualifications required for appointment of county superintendents. As a result of a recent grant made by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund the State board of charities and public welfare has placed additional workers in selected counties in order to demonstrate what can be accomplished by a more adequate staff than the local appropriation has provided for.¹²

OUTSTANDING FEATURES OF THE NORTH CAROLINA SYSTEM

Several outstanding features in the North Carolina system should be noted especially in any attempt to compare it with other States:

1. There was a greater degree of interrelation and coordination in the work of the various State and county departments than is found in many other States. The heads of all State departments met together as a governor's council which had a definite function, so that the State departments were brought into very close relation. The interrelation was particularly striking in the counties. The county health officer was the medical examiner of the schools; the chairman of the county board of education was a member of the county board of health; the superintendent of public welfare was chief attendance officer for the schools and chief probation officer for the juvenile court. The chairman of the county commissioners was a member of the board of health. Thus the care of the poor, school attendance, juvenile-court work, and the control of child labor were intimately associated and interwoven in a most interesting fashion. To what extent social difficulties and maladjustments will be discovered and treated as a result of this system will be watched with interest.

2. Throughout North Carolina the county is the unit for the administration of education, health, and welfare. The county system makes it much simpler to develop close cooperation among all agencies that are dealing with children and their problems than would be the case if one or more of the three lines of work were administered with the township as a unit.

3. Although county responsibility for administration is clearly defined a certain degree of State control was recognized, particularly in relation to the selection of the chief administrative executives. The superintendent of public welfare was appointed by the county board of education and the county commissioners jointly but must be certified as qualified to perform the duties by the State board of charities and public welfare. The county juvenile court appointed its

¹²In 1926 there were in 51 counties full-time superintendents of public welfare, 7 of whom had assistants. In 8 counties there were part-time superintendents, and in 49 others the superintendents of schools acted as superintendents of public welfare. An interesting recent development is the extension of work among the negroes, made possible by a grant from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund. Thirteen counties had negro workers in 1926, and two others had raised funds for the employment of negro workers. Four of these negro workers had had four years of college work, six had had two years, and two were high-school graduates. Six of the 13 had taken special courses in social work. Public-welfare institutes are held at a normal institution for training negro workers; and 65 workers were registered in January, 1926.

probation officer, but he also must be approved by the State board of public welfare. The county superintendent of health was appointed by the county board of health, and the county superintendent of schools was appointed by the county board of education with the approval of the State board of education. Thus the State could directly influence or practically control the type of county executives responsible for the administration of the various county departments.

4. The county child-welfare program is primarily related to the public schools but relates also to the juvenile courts and the poor-law administration.

5. The county executives with few exceptions have been local appointees who have begun their tasks without previous training or experience in social case work but who are being trained through the joint effort of the State board of charities and public welfare and the school of social welfare of the university.

How this system has worked out was determined by a study of representative counties. At the suggestion of the State board of charities and public welfare three counties were visited as typical of those in which some degree of progress had been made in the child-caring field.¹³

ACTIVITIES OF COUNTY BOARDS AND COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS

For convenience of comparison topics are taken up in the same order for North Carolina as for Minnesota though the relative importance of the various phases of the work differs greatly in the two States.

PROTECTION OF UNMARRIED MOTHERS

Little provision had been made in North Carolina for the care of young unmarried mothers. A small maternity home in Greensboro, N.C., a Florence Crittenton Home in Charlotte, N.C., and a Salvation Army rescue home in South Carolina were used occasionally.

These cases were brought to the attention of the county superintendents of public welfare by anyone hearing of them. Although the law provides that no infant shall be separated from its mother during its first six months of life except with the consent of the county health officer and the clerk of the superior court (juvenile-court judge),¹⁴ separations occur frequently with the approval of these officials and the superintendents of welfare, who find it difficult to provide for the mother and child together.

A pitiful comment on the situation was a statement made by a worker who for eight years had been caring for babies separated from such mothers pending their placement in free homes for adoption by a private child-caring agency. She said that she had never seen a mother who really desired to give up her child, adding that while she was willing to take the babies she always said to those consulting her not to let the mothers come with the babies, because the scenes at the moment of separation were too painful. Seven tiny babies were at the moment in her care. Ways of helping such mothers keep their babies were still to be developed in North Carolina. At the time of the study the opinion that the child born out of wedlock is invariably

¹³ For summary of data obtained in these three counties see Appendix B, pp. 80-96.

¹⁴ N.C., Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 1), sec. 4445, p. 1814.

better off if removed from its mother seemed to be widely held. The problem was approached with an assumption that mother and child were to be separated unless a very exceptional situation was found—rather than that the tie between the mother and her baby was to be severed only for the gravest possible reasons and after mature deliberation.

CARE OF DEPENDENT AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN

Child placing and supervision, a difficult branch of child care, had not been given the attention that they deserve from the State board of charities and public welfare, because the staff had been inadequate.¹⁵ The law authorizes the State board to undertake the placing and supervision of dependent, delinquent, and defective children,¹⁶ but the board had been unable to undertake child placing.

A private children's home society, with headquarters in Greensboro, N. C., for years had accepted children from all parts of the State and placed them in foster homes. The State board of public welfare is empowered to license and inspect all child-caring agencies and institutions,¹⁷ but its staff has not been able to give sufficient time to such inspections to affect materially the individual standards that have been developed by each agency.

Many of the county superintendents of public welfare were placing children in foster homes within their own territories, possibly with a greater degree of confidence than of skill. Most American homes probably are reasonably safe for children, so that the majority of these placements may be satisfactory. However, only a much closer inquiry before placement and a more thorough supervision after placement can insure the welfare of foster children. Particularly must this be true in a State where children have a minimum legal protection against labor and where the danger of exploitation therefore would be more acute. The State board of public welfare recognized the need for introducing and enforcing better standards of investigation and of supervision of both public and private agencies; and it hopes to obtain necessary appropriations to develop this work in the near future. In the meantime the methods of placement are far below standard.

TO JUVENILE COURTS

The juvenile court act passed in 1919 was state-wide in its application. It gave to these courts exclusive original jurisdiction in "any case of a child less than 16 years of age residing in or being at this time within their respective districts" who was delinquent, neglected, or dependent on public support, or destitute, homeless, or abandoned, or whose custody was subject to controversy.¹⁸

The clerk of the superior court of the county was made the judge of the juvenile court. This unusual provision was an extension of the duties in relation to children already performed by clerks of county superior courts in North Carolina. Although these clerks of the superior court seldom were lawyers they previously had been authorized to appoint guardians and to bind out destitute children.

¹⁵ Since this report was written, however, the State board with an augmented staff, has made notable progress in this field.

¹⁶ N. C., Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 2), sec. 5006 (3), p. 97.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, sec. 5006 (4) and (5), p. 97.

¹⁸ N. C., Public Laws of 1919, ch. 97, secs. 1-26, pp. 243-254 (Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 2), secs. 5039-5062, p. 106, (sec. 5040 as amended by act of Aug. 26, 1920, ch. 85, Public Laws of 1920, p. 108, and sec. 5062 as amended by act of Mar. 6, 1923, ch. 193, Public Laws of 1923, p. 509)).

As clerks they prepared the cases of delinquent children who were to be tried in the superior court. In many cases the judges of the superior courts depended upon the clerks to recommend what should be done with each child; and the clerk had a wider experience in the judicial handling of destitute and neglected children than any other official in the county.

Cities having more than 10,000 inhabitants were required either to establish separate juvenile courts or to combine, by agreement, with the county juvenile court. In combining, however, the city was required to pay for one or more probation officers quite apart from any probation service the county might provide.

Only 3 of the 14 cities having a population of more than 10,000 (Winston-Salem, Raleigh, and High Point) had organized separate courts, all three of these being in connection with the city recorder's courts. Each of the other 11 cities (Charlotte, Wilmington, Asheville, Durham, Greensboro, Salisbury, Gastonia, Rocky Mount, Newbern, Goldsboro, and Wilson) had combined its juvenile court with the county juvenile court; and Raleigh had considered combining its juvenile court with the county juvenile court. In Asheville a full-time judge of the juvenile court heard all city and county cases.

The law also permits any city having a population of more than 5,000 which is not a county seat to establish a separate court; but none of the five small cities in this class had availed itself of this provision.

The statute makes the county superintendent of public welfare the chief probation officer of the juvenile court. Up to the present time the superintendent frequently remains the only probation officer, although the law states that "the judge of the juvenile court in each county shall appoint one or more suitable persons probation officers, who "shall be approved by the State board of charities and public welfare." Thus the law clearly contemplates provision of assistance for the superintendents of public welfare in this branch of their work. In 1924 only three counties were employing full-time probation officers.

The law does not make clear the relation of the superintendent of public welfare as the chief probation officer to the court except as he is designated "chief" and has supervision over the work of any additional probation officers that may be appointed.¹⁹

INVESTIGATIONS FOR MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES

In order to stimulate provision of adequate relief in the home and to avoid the needless breaking up of families the State Conference of Social Work and others interested in the subject in North Carolina obtained in 1923 the passage of a mothers' aid law.²⁰ This provided for a State appropriation of \$50,000, for assistance of mothers of children under 14 years of age to be apportioned among the counties taking advantage of the provisions of the statute. The appropriation is to be apportioned among the counties on a per capita basis, each county being entitled to reimbursement by the State to the extent

¹⁹ N. C., Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 2), sec. 5049, p. 111.

²⁰ N. C., act of Feb. 26, 1923, ch. 260, Public Laws of 1923, pp. 583-585 (Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 3, Supplement of 1924), sec. 5067 (a)-(h), p. 317). Section 5067 (h) was amended by act of Mar. 10, 1925, ch. 292, Public Laws of 1925, p. 555.

of one-half of the sum it has expended within the limits of its apportionment. Fifty-four counties promptly accepted this plan, and 187 families with 750 children were receiving aid on June 15, 1924. Sixty-one of the 100 counties of the State had accepted the plan and made appropriation therefor before the end of the year 1924.

Assistance was permitted to any mother who had resided in the State for three years and in the county for one year, and who was "possessed of sufficient mental, moral, and physical fitness to be capable of maintaining a home for herself and child or children and prevented only from lack of means." She must be "a widow, divorced, deserted, if it be found impossible to require the husband to support her, or the husband is found to be mentally or physically incapacitated to support his family, or if the husband is confined in any jail or in any penal or eleemosynary institution, provided no relative is able or willing to undertake sufficient aid."

The law fixes a maximum allowance of \$15 a month for one child, \$10 additional for a second child, and \$5 additional for each additional child, the total amount not to exceed \$40 monthly, except in "extraordinary circumstances," which are not defined. The consent of the board of county commissioners only is needed for relief to be given in any amount deemed necessary in "extraordinary circumstances." The county board of child welfare must make a recommendation in each allowance case. In the counties visited by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau the county superintendent of welfare usually, after an investigation, submitted a report to the county board of public welfare. If the recommendation of the superintendent was approved he then made the report with recommendations to the board of county commissioners, which invariably had been accepted by them. The grant to each family must be approved by the State board. By the opportunity this gives for checking up the case work done on mothers' allowances the State board expects to be able to raise the standard of case work generally.

ADMINISTRATION OF GENERAL POOR RELIEF

The laws of North Carolina provide for county homes for the aged and infirm and for their management, and specify that "the board of commissioners shall make such arrangements for the support of paupers with their friends or other persons when not maintained at the county home for the aged and infirm as may be deemed best."²¹ The county boards of commissioners are further empowered to "provide by taxation for the maintenance of the poor and to do everything expedient for their comfort and well ordering."²² These provisions leave the way open for adequate and suitable care for all needy persons having a settlement in any county; but North Carolina, like most other States, had permitted outside relief to drag along on an unsound basis. Small doles were given for an indefinite period to those persons whose names were once put on the lists.

As county superintendents of public welfare have become established in their counties the county commissioners have been turning over to them the lists of outside poor, and investigations are being made periodically. Names of unsuitable persons and even deceased

²¹ N. C., Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 1), sec. 1341, p. 580.

²² *Ibid.*, sec. 1335, p. 578.

persons are being removed from these lists. Increased allowances are being granted, although it is true that so far the county superintendents seem to have moved slowly in modifying the ancient method of administering outdoor relief. Yet it was noticeable in the reports examined that whereas formerly \$3 was considered a large monthly allowance many \$5 allowances appear on the present lists, and a few \$10 allowances. One instance of an allowance of \$15 was observed. There seems to be no reason why this much-abused form of public relief should not be revolutionized completely through the administration of these funds under supervision of the superintendents.

PROMOTION OF SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

In 1923 the school attendance law was strengthened. It now requires every child from 7 to 14 years of age to be in school continuously during the school session, except that the principals, superintendents, and teachers are given the right to excuse a child for temporary absence "on account of sickness or distance of residence from the school or other unavoidable reason not constituting truancy."²³

This rather large loophole was guarded in some measure by a provision that the State board of education should formulate such rules and regulations as should be necessary for the proper enforcement of the law, and specifically that it should prescribe what constitutes truancy, what causes may be considered legitimate excuse for temporary nonattendance due to mental or physical incapacity, and under what circumstances teachers, principals, or superintendents may excuse pupils for nonattendance due to important demands of the farm or in the homes at certain times of the year and in certain sections of the State.

In conformity with this provision and in conference with the State board of charities and public welfare were formulated rules which after formal adoption were issued by the State board of education. These rules have the effect of statutory law. Together with the comments of the State board of education they are as follows:

Section 2a of the compulsory school act provides that "immediate demands of the farm or home" in certain seasons of the year in several sections of the State shall constitute a legal excuse for temporary nonattendance, and the State board of education is authorized to formulate such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to meet the provisions of the act.

Since the conditions in different parts of the State are so unlike, the State board of education authorizes the county boards of education to excuse temporary nonattendance in any particular county where the agricultural conditions are such as to show a reasonable need for the services of the children, under the following conditions:

1. Where it is apparent that the demands of the farm are serious enough to require the immediate services of the child; and
2. Where it is apparent that sufficient assistance to meet these demands is not at hand and can not be secured.
3. Where it is apparent that the demands of the home, due to sickness or other causes, are such as to call for the immediate assistance of any child; and
4. Where it is apparent that immediate assistance is not available in the home and can not be secured.

A full report of each and every case coming under this section must be sent to the State department of education on blanks supplied by the State superintendent of public instruction, in order that the State board of education may determine to what extent this section of the law is appealed to.

²³ N. C., act of Mar. 3, 1923, ch. 136, secs. 347-353, Public Laws of 1923, pp. 418-420; (Consolidated Stat. 1924 (vol. 3), secs. 5757-5763, pp. 449-451).

There is no desire to work any hardship on any community. The object is to secure attendance first, and not to make the law so stringent as to work a hardship. It is well known that in the trucking season of the year the assistance of the older children in many cases is necessary. Moreover, at certain times during the cotton-picking season the assistance of the children is necessary. In other sections of the State agricultural demands may be such as to make the assistance of the older children necessary. But it hardly can be said that the children under 10 years of age can be of much assistance, either in the cases of farm or domestic needs.

In such seasons of the year it might be wise to open school earlier and close about 12 or 1 o'clock, thus permitting the pupils to attend school the first half of the day and to aid their parents the second half. This has been tried with success in certain districts, and only a very few students are actually required in the home or in the fields during the school session.

The laws and rules recognize that responsibility for regular school attendance rests primarily with the teachers and the school authorities, but the efforts of the school people are to be supplemented by the county superintendents of public welfare.

On each Friday every superintendent or teacher in charge of a school building was required to report to the county superintendent of public welfare every child who had been absent during the week for any reason not listed as excusable, and also to report any unusual circumstances causing excused absences, such as mental incapacity. Any absence excused because of distance from school was also to be reported to the county board of education, which was required "to provide for the attendance of such child." The great difficulty created by the demand in certain counties for the assistance of children under 14 years of age during seasons of planting and of gathering the crops is recognized in the law itself and in the formulation of rules. However, in the judgment of the State board of education and of the State board of public welfare the rules are as stringent as the present state of public opinion in North Carolina permits. Both teachers and welfare workers were dissatisfied with the present law and the present rules. Girls under the age of 14 are kept at home regularly a half day or a day a week to do the family washing; and boys and some girls were frequently kept at home to do farm work. Such absences can be excused by the teachers. It is hoped and expected that the rules will be modified from time to time so as gradually to reduce the absences for such reasons.

It is as attendance officers that the superintendents of public welfare in North Carolina find their opportunity of reaching child-welfare problems in the earlier stages. When illness, poverty, neglect, or delinquency develops in the home, absence from school is likely to be an early manifestation of the trouble. If such absences can be followed up promptly by county superintendents of welfare the number of children requiring care outside their homes can be reduced to a minimum through the early correction of these difficulties within the home.

The school attendance law contains a provision of great significance, which offers a method for the effective elimination of absences on the ground of economic pressure, but as yet advantage had not been taken of it. This provision is shown in the following extracts:

If affidavit shall be made by the parent of a child or by any other person that any child between the ages of 7 and 14 years is not able to attend school by

reason of necessity to work or labor for the support of itself or the support of the family, then the attendance officer shall diligently inquire into the matter and bring it to the attention of some court allowed by law to act as a juvenile court, and said court shall proceed to find whether as a matter of fact such parents or persons in loco parentis are unable to send the child to school for the term of a compulsory attendance for the reasons given. If the court shall find, after careful investigation, that the parents have made or are making a bona fide effort to comply with the compulsory attendance act, and by reason of illness, lack of earning capacity, or any other cause which the court may deem valid and sufficient, are unable to send said child to school, then the court shall find and state what help is needed for the family to enable the attendance law to be complied with. The court shall transmit its finding to the county board of education of the county, or in cities, to the city board in which the case may arise.²⁴

The county board of education shall in its discretion order aid to be given the family from the incidental expense fund of the county school budget to an extent not to exceed \$10 per month for such child during continuance of the compulsory term, and shall at the same time require said officer to see that the money is used for the purpose for which it is appropriated, and to report from time to time whether it shall be continued or withdrawn. And the county board of education is hereby authorized in making out the county budget to provide a sum to meet the provisions of this article.²⁵

If this provision is made effective, child labor could be eliminated entirely as far as children of school age are concerned. If the work of a child was shown to be not necessary for economic reasons he could be ordered back to school by the court. If the child's work was an economic necessity the payment of \$10 a month—in some cases a less sum—to the parents would relieve the situation and secure regular school attendance in the families in which absences are most likely to occur.

The sections of the law which had been relied upon to compel school attendance read as follows:

Every parent, guardian, or other person in the State of North Carolina having charge or control of a child between the ages of 7 and 14 years shall cause such child to attend school continuously for a period equal to the time which the public school in the district in which the child resides shall be in session.²⁶

Any parent, guardian, or other person violating the provisions of this article shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be liable to a fine of not less than \$5 nor more than \$25, and upon failure or refusal to pay such fine the said parent, guardian, or other person shall be imprisoned not exceeding 30 days in the county jail.²⁷

The county superintendent of public welfare or chief school attendance officer or truant officers provided for by law shall investigate and prosecute all violations of the provisions of this article.²⁸

ASSISTANCE TO THE STATE CHILD-WELFARE COMMISSION IN REGARD TO CHILD LABOR

A child-welfare commission composed of the State superintendent of public instruction, the secretary of the State board of health, and the commissioner of public welfare of the State had been made responsible both for factory inspection and for issuance of certificates to children desiring to enter industry. The commission was empowered to make rules and regulations to carry the law into effect.

²⁴ N. C., Consolidated Stat. 1924 (vol. 3), sec. 5762, p. 450.

²⁵ Ibid., sec. 5763, p. 451.

²⁶ Ibid., sec. 5757, p. 449.

²⁷ Ibid., sec. 5760, p. 450.

²⁸ Ibid., sec. 4761, p. 450.

The duties of county superintendent of public welfare with reference to child labor are defined as follows in the rules adopted:

To act as the commissioned agent of the State child-welfare commission, and assist in enforcing the child labor law and other acts relative to business and industry.

To supervise and direct the child in employment.

To issue certificate for employment and to establish age.

To investigate and make detailed inspection of places prescribed in the law.

To exercise the necessary authority in correcting violations discovered.

To record and report the duties performed as required by rules of the commission.²⁰

In practice the inspectors of the State child-welfare commission made the inspections and took steps to correct violations. The county superintendents of welfare issued the working certificates for employment, getting the required proof of age, the medical certificate, the school record, and the parents' consent. If funds are made available the county superintendents will be in a strategic position to influence working conditions of children, both in occupations regulated by law and in such forms of domestic and farm labor as are detrimental to the education and health of children.

In two of the three counties visited very few work certificates were issued, as they were largely agricultural counties. In the third county about 200 were issued each year.

In these counties very small children were observed to be working in the fields in large numbers.

SUPERVISION OF CHILDREN ON PAROLE FROM STATE INSTITUTIONS

Each State institution for delinquent children has one parole officer. The county superintendent of public welfare is notified when children who were committed from the county are to be discharged. Parole placements made by the State parole agents are also referred for supervision to the superintendent of welfare in the county where the placement has been made. The State officers are just beginning to place children on parole outside of the homes from which they come. This duty did not seem to occupy much of the time or thought of the superintendent of welfare in the counties visited by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau.

RELATED STATE WELFARE PROGRAMS

No study of county welfare in North Carolina or of its progress in the field of child care would be complete without a brief consideration of the progress of this State along various other lines within the past four or five years.

DEVELOPMENT OF GOOD ROADS

After several years of agitation North Carolina had developed within the past half dozen years a system of State highways which reached into every county of the State. The plan followed was not only to develop arterial highways; it included a plan for the State to take over and keep in condition all roads connecting county seats. In 1924 the State was maintaining more than 6,000 miles of public

²⁰ State Laws Governing Public Welfare Work in North Carolina. Special Bulletin No. 1, p. 13. North Carolina State Board of Charities and Public Welfare, Raleigh, 1923.

highways. It was said that no person in North Carolina lived farther than 5 miles from a road as good as Fifth Avenue, New York City. This was breaking down the isolation which was responsible for many problems. The highways were being lined with modern homes, many of them modest in size but neat and attractive. People were moving to the highways from isolated dwelling places. The problem of transporting children to schools was being solved, and intercourse between towns was being made easy. Health and welfare workers could cover their territory with a minimum expenditure of time, and central clinics were possible because of the ease of transporting patients to them. The good-road program of the State can be considered a social-welfare movement of wide significance which materially contributes to the welfare of the children.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS

A second great State welfare program, and really the fundamental one, is the development of its educational system, including the establishment of consolidated schools. The district schools are on a six-month basis, and all consolidated schools are on a nine-month basis. Through the assistance of a State equalization fund and a State loan fund, consolidated schools were rapidly being built throughout the State. By the construction of modern buildings and provision for the payment of higher salaries to teachers the schools for both white and negro children had been improved materially. School attendance is required by law under the age of 14 only, but increasing numbers of children were remaining in school over that age. In the counties visited it was reported that 50 per cent more children attended consolidated schools during the full nine months of the sessions than attended the old schools during the six-month period. The State percentage of illiteracy had fallen from 18.5 per cent in 1910 to 13.1 per cent in 1920. The percentage of illiteracy among the native white population in 1920 was 8.2, which was very much higher than the rate in Minnesota.

The county-welfare project knits into this developing school program. The first duty of the superintendent of welfare, as stated in the law, is that of chief attendance officer, and it is added that he "shall have other duties."³⁰ For smaller counties where the superintendent of public instruction becomes also the superintendent of public welfare the law provides that the superintendent shall receive such assistance as is deemed necessary "to have the compulsory school attendance law fully enforced."³¹ The school program of the State, developing later than in the North and West, is related to the present child-welfare movement in a way which is of great significance.

COUNTY HEALTH PROGRAMS

The third state-wide program of immediate social consequence is the State and county health program. Counties having a population of more than 32,000 were required to have a full-time county health officer who served under a county board of health. The State board

³⁰ N. C., Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 2), sec. 5017, p. 99.

³¹ *Ibid.*, sec. 5016, as amended by act of Mar. 4, 1921, ch. 128, Public Laws of 1921, p. 385 (Consolidated Stat. 1924 (vol. 3), sec. 5016, p. 313).

of health had formulated a well-rounded health program, which had been adopted by 30 of the counties in the State, representing 50 per cent of the State's population. Any county adopting this program received from the State \$2,500 per year, which the county must equal. In the majority of counties an additional sum was appropriated, so that more than \$5,000 is available for health purposes. The county health officer was the medical inspector of the county schools.³² Recently a maternity and infancy program had been added in a number of counties. The county health officer administered preventive inoculations and vaccinations against smallpox, typhoid, diphtheria, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and blood poisoning. Unlike most States the county health departments of North Carolina, either with or without assistance of the State department of health, conducted corrective as well as preventive medical and dental clinics, including clinics for the examination of crippled children, for the removal of tonsils and adenoids, for the treatment of venereal diseases, and for diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis. In the counties in which this broad health program had been organized a great contribution had been made to the solving of social problems, and the child-welfare program of North Carolina had been notably promoted.

³²N. C., Consolidated Stat. 1919 (vol. 2), sec. 7068, p. 736.

PUBLIC CHILD-CARING WORK IN DUTCHESS COUNTY, N. Y.

CHILD CARE PRIOR TO 1917

The plan of child care in Dutchess County, N. Y., presents a type of public program for child care different in many ways from those developed in Minnesota and North Carolina. In developing county programs for children the fundamental difference in the situation in New York from that in Minnesota and North Carolina lies in the traditional policy in regard to the public support of destitute children outside their own homes. The New York system has developed an acceptance on the part of public officials and of the communities generally that certain children are to be supported by public money. In Minnesota and North Carolina, as has been shown in the sections of this report dealing with those States, local public officials have provided few, if any, funds for the public support of poor children except those benefited by mothers' allowances, even though the general legal provisions for the support of poor persons make the public support of children possible.

Dutchess County is a rural county having a population of 92,000 and containing two small cities (one of 35,000 population, the other of 11,000).¹ It has a variety of small factories and a farming and dairying population, also a number of large estates of well-to-do people.

As early as 1857 New York authorized the care of destitute children at public expense outside almshouses,² but it was not until 1875 that almshouse care of children was prohibited by an act making it unlawful to place children between 3 and 16 years of age in almshouses and requiring officials charged with poor relief to "provide for their care and support in families, orphan asylums, or other appropriate institutions" unless a child was unfitted for family care.³ This prohibition was extended in 1878 to include children a year younger (children between 2 and 16 years of age),⁴ and its intent was clarified by the 1896 revision of the poor law,⁵ which specifically permitted a child under 2 years of age to be in an almshouse with his mother. It is under these provisions of the poor law that the public responsibility for the care and support of poor children has been developed in New York.

When the law was passed in 1875 providing that children, except infants with their mothers, should no longer be cared for in almshouses, the custom developed for public officials to commit children to privately managed child-caring institutions. So large a number of children were sent to such institutions by both poor-law officials and the courts that New York enjoyed the unenviable reputation of having a larger proportionate population of children in institutions than any other State in the Union. When children were committed to an institution by a court their custody passed to the institution,

¹ Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920, Vol. IV, Population, pp. 685, 691. Washington, 1922.

² N. Y., act of Mar. 2, 1857, ch. 61, Laws of 1857, p. 94.

³ N. Y., act of Apr. 24, 1875, ch. 173, Laws of 1875, p. 150.

⁴ N. Y., act of June 8, 1878, ch. 404, Laws of 1878, p. 483.

⁵ N. Y., act of Apr. 8, 1896, ch. 225, sec. 56, Laws of 1896, p. 136.

the public officials becoming responsible for their support on a per capita basis. Under constitutional provision these private institutions could receive public money only under rules established by the State board of charities. The State board of charities ruled that except in cases of delinquents committed by court a private institution could receive public money only for children—whether committed by the court or otherwise—who were in each case accepted as public charges by the official charged with the care of the poor in the community from which the child came. The private institutions in the State came to depend for their support, on the per diem funds collected from the public treasury; and this division of responsibility between the officials and the institutions has had its drawbacks. (Of great significance, therefore, is the Suffolk County act, described on p. 59 of this report, which clearly placed responsibility for custody of all destitute and neglected children upon the board responsible for their support.)

Each county in New York is responsible for the care of its own poor. The board of supervisors can determine whether the unit of administration shall be the county or the town, except that outdoor relief must remain a town function. Each county has a county superintendent of the poor, and each town has one or more overseers of the poor.

The penal law provides for the protection of children and, until the state-wide establishment of county children's courts in 1922,⁶ for the hearing of all save the gravest offenses against children in the police courts in the cities and before justices of the peace elsewhere in the county. In New York justices of the peace need not be lawyers, and usually they are not. Each of the 21 towns in Dutchess County had three justices of the peace. The superintendent of the poor, the overseers of the poor, and the justices of the peace are elective officers.

To assist these numerous public officials in their duties as they relate to the care and protection of children the New York State Charities Aid Association organized in 1909 the Dutchess County Agency for Dependent Children, which was conducted for seven years under a joint agreement between a county committee of the association and the local officials (the county board of supervisors and the county superintendent of the poor).

The mothers' allowance law, passed in 1915, provided that in all counties there should be created county boards of child welfare to administer the aid established by this law.⁷ Members were to be appointed by the county judge, and the county superintendent of the poor was ex officio a member. From the beginning the Dutchess County Board of Child Welfare arranged that the county agent, whose work had been effective and had become widely known, should make its investigations.

DEVELOPMENT OF A CENTRALIZED SYSTEM

In 1917 there was passed the Dutchess County act,⁸ which created a new county board of child welfare to consist of 10 members. Six of the members were to be appointed jointly by the county judge and

⁶ N. Y., act of Apr. 10, 1922, ch. 547, Laws of 1922, pp. 1259-1276. For discussion of the work of county boards of child welfare in giving assistance to children's courts see p. 58 of this report.

⁷ N. Y., act of Apr. 7, 1915, ch. 228, Laws of 1915, pp. 690-694 (adding Art. 7-A, secs. 143-155, to the General Municipal Law).

⁸ N. Y., act of May 3, 1917, ch. 354, Laws of 1917, pp. 1159-1167.

the county superintendent of the poor; four others—the county superintendent of the poor and the chairman and two other members of the county board of supervisors—were to be members *ex officio*. As Dutchess County was among those which had made the county the unit of poor-law administration, the transition was simpler than it would have been if the town system of administration had prevailed. This act creating the new Dutchess County Board of Child Welfare transferred to it all the powers and duties of poor-law officials as they related to the care of children and also those of the then existing board of child welfare, which was administering allowances to mothers. Members of the board of child welfare were to serve without pay, but they were “entitled to actual and necessary expenses incurred * * * in discharging their official duties.”

The members of the board were found to be actively interested in the work, but they relied upon the judgment of the superintendent for case-work details. In 1924 the board held 13 meetings, with an average attendance of seven members.

It is to be emphasized that the new system was a development, not a creation of a social engineer. For seven years previous to the passage of the special act the Dutchess County Agency for Dependent Children performed most of the duties that were imposed upon the board of child welfare in 1917. The primary function of the agency had been to improve the local public administration of such relief or support of children as was authorized by the laws of the State of New York. Although the officials alone could order the support of a child from the public funds the recommendation of the children's agent was a controlling factor in determining what children required such support and where they were to be sent for care. The private organization had developed standards for the qualifications of the social workers to be employed, the kind of work to be undertaken, and the quality of the social work to be done. The people of the county knew the work and the workers and supported the agency (about one-half by private contribution and one-half by county taxation). The support of children in boarding homes or in institutions was paid from county money after an audit by the board of supervisors. The newly created county board of child welfare took over the staff of the private organization and adopted its standards; and with no confusion or delay there was put in operation a child-caring program which was supported wholly by public appropriation and directed solely by a public board.

THE BOARD OF CHILD WELFARE

The act creating the board of child welfare fixed definitely upon it the duty of caring for needy children. Its powers and duties are defined as follows:

The said board shall, as soon as it publicly announces that it is prepared to discharge the duties imposed upon it by this act, have powers and duties with respect to destitute, neglected, delinquent, and defective children within the county of Dutchess or any city within said county under 16 years of age where the welfare of such children requires, as follows:

1. *As to destitute children.*—A child shall be deemed destitute when its parents or surviving parent, its guardian or trustee, are unable to provide suitable food, clothing; shelter, or medical care for the child. In such cases where the welfare of such child requires the board shall—

(a) Administer and supervise needed charitable relief in their own homes to competent mothers or guardians with dependent children who are legally entitled to such relief from Dutchess County or any city in said county.

(b) Receive as public charges upon the county all destitute children who require and are legally entitled to public support from Dutchess County or any city in said county outside their own homes.

(c) Receive as public charges upon the county all destitute children who are adjudged by a court or magistrate of competent jurisdiction to be without proper guardianship, unless committed by such court or magistrate to a State institution.

(d) Place and supervise children so received as public charges upon the county or any city in said county in private boarding homes or in institutions as the needs of the children require.

(e) Place children so received, in suitable instances, in family homes under proper safeguards either directly or through duly incorporated child-caring societies or institutions.

2. *As to neglected children.*—A child shall be deemed to be neglected when having no proper guardianship, as defined in section 486 of the penal law. In such cases where the welfare of such child requires the board shall—

(a) Investigate complaints of neglect or abuse of children.

(b) Advise and warn in suitable instances any family in which a child is neglected, but not to such an extent as to require court action.

(c) When necessary institute proceedings in a court of competent jurisdiction against a parent or other adult for any offense committed against a child.

(d) Receive as public charges upon the county all neglected children who are adjudged by a court or magistrate of competent jurisdiction to be without proper guardianship, unless committed by such court or magistrate to a State institution.

(e) Place and supervise any neglected child so received in a boarding home, in a family home, or in an institution as the needs of such child require.

3. *As to delinquent children.*—A child shall be deemed to be delinquent when guilty of violating any law or ordinance for which a legal penalty is prescribed. In such cases where the welfare of such child requires the board shall—

(a) Receive as public charges upon the county all delinquent children committed by any court or magistrate unless committed by such court or magistrate to a State institution.

(b) Place any delinquent child so received in a private institution legally authorized to receive delinquent children on judicial commitment, or in a private family under such conditions as the board may determine.

4. *As to defective children.*—A child shall be deemed to be defective who shall be (1) insane, epileptic, idiotic, imbecile, or feeble-minded; (2) blind; (3) a deaf mute, or (4) physically crippled. In such cases where the welfare of such child requires the board shall—

(a) Obtain admission to State or other suitable schools, hospitals, or other institutions for defective children needing such care.

(b) Obtain treatment and care in their own homes or elsewhere for all defective children not in need of institutional care or when suitable institutional care can not be obtained.

(c) Maintain supervision over such defective children as are not in State institutions.

5. *As to all foregoing classes of children.*—The board shall—

(a) Investigate the family circumstances of each child reported as destitute, neglected, delinquent, or defective in order to determine what care, supervision, treatment, or other attention, if any, such child requires.

(b) Provide for the expert mental or physical examination of any child who may come under the care or supervision of the said board and whom the board has reason to suspect of mental or physical defect or disease, such examination to be paid for from the moneys in control of the board if necessary.

(c) Provide for the necessary medical or surgical care in a suitable hospital, sanitarium, preventorium, or other suitable institution, or in its own home, for any child coming under the care or supervision of the board, such care to be paid for from moneys in control of the board if necessary.

(d) Ascertain the financial ability of the parents of all children who become public charges upon the county or any city in said county, and collect toward the expenses of such children's care such reasonable sum as the parents consent to pay.

(e) Collect from fathers whose children have been committed to the board by any court or magistrate such sums as they are ordered by such court or magistrate to pay for the maintenance of such children. The board shall also report

willful failure to comply with such order to said court or magistrate for action against such parents.

(f) Administer relief in their homes to destitute parents with children under the age of 16 years when said parents are fit physically, mentally, and morally to care for their children, and when such relief is required to insure such care to the children as the board deems necessary.

(g) Place any child received as a public charge upon the county in a home or in an institution of the religious faith of its parents whenever practicable.

6. *As to children from the county of Dutchess or any city in said county discharged from State institutions.*—The board shall—

Cooperate with the State institutions for neglected, delinquent, and defective children to ascertain the conditions of the home and the character and habits of the parents of such children before their discharge from such State institutions, and make recommendations as to the advisability of returning said children to their homes. In case the board shall deem it unwise to have any such child return to its former home such State institution may with the consent of the board parole such child into the custody of said board.

7. *As to office, records, and accounts.*—The board shall—

Establish an office and keep therein a full and complete record of every case reported to or otherwise coming, either directly or indirectly, within the jurisdiction of such board.

Give an official receipt for each and all moneys received toward the support or relief of any child, keep complete and accurate accounts of all moneys received or disbursed, and pay over to the county treasurer within 30 days after receipt thereof all moneys received by the boards from parents toward the support of their children as authorized by section 5 of this act.

8. *As to officers and employees.*—When appropriations have been made for such purposes the board shall employ a superintendent and such other employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

9. *As to rules and regulations.*—The board shall establish rules and regulations for the conduct of its business and for the keeping and protection of its records.

10. *Report and estimate to board of supervisors.*—The board shall—

Submit annually to the board of supervisors a detailed report of its transactions for the preceding fiscal year with such conclusions and recommendations as it may deem proper.

Submit to the board of supervisors before the annual meeting of that board for the appropriations of money and levying of taxes an estimate of the moneys needed to carry out the purposes of this act during the ensuing fiscal year.⁹

The board of supervisors was "authorized and required annually to appropriate such sums of money as in their discretion may be needed to carry out the provisions of this act."¹⁰ The power of the board to provide any form of case-work treatment was limited only by its ability to get the necessary appropriations. The three supervisors who were members of the board of child welfare had been its spokesmen in presenting its needs to the county board of supervisors when increased appropriations were desired. On the whole the new system worked well, although the county at the time was not ready to establish a juvenile court.

Children's courts were established throughout the State in 1922.¹¹ In Dutchess County the county judge was designated to act as judge of the children's court. With the county children's court in operation the centralized county program for child care was completed. The judge of the children's court turned at once to the board of child welfare for assistance.

The relation of the county board of child welfare to the State board of charities is that the county board is subject to inspection by the State board exactly as are all other charitable agencies in the State

⁹N. Y., act of May 3, 1917, ch. 354, sec. 5, Laws of 1917, pp. 1162-1165.

¹⁰Ibid., sec. 7, Laws of 1917, p. 1165.

¹¹N. Y., act of Apr. 10, 1922, ch. 547, Laws of 1922, pp. 1259-1276. This act was amended generally by act of Apr. 25, 1924, ch. 436, Laws of 1924, p. 790.

that are supported by public funds or in receipt of them.¹² The county board does not in the performance of any duties represent the State board of charities. This is in contrast with the situation in Minnesota (see p. 12) and North Carolina (see p. 35). Its duties are exclusively those which in other counties of the State devolve upon the poor-law officials and the boards that grant allowances to mothers. On the other hand, the New York Board of Charities carries no responsibility for the custody, guardianship, or support of individual children, as does the State Board of Control of Minnesota. The State board inspects the work of the county board, analyzes its case work, suggests improvements, and stimulates better methods; but the county alone is responsible for the support and protection of children in need of special care.

OUTSTANDING FEATURES OF THE DUTCHESS COUNTY SYSTEM

One of the distinctive features of the Dutchess County plan is that the public board which determines the child's need by case work is the sole disbursing agency for such public funds as are available for support and for case-work treatment. It administers relief in the home and provides hospital, boarding, or institutional care according to the requirement in each instance. Another distinctive feature is that Dutchess County not only has provided a comprehensive and workable public program for the support and protection of destitute, delinquent, and defective children but also has assumed full responsibility for protecting children from neglect and cruelty. Upon the public board of child welfare is placed direct responsibility for performing those duties which in other fields frequently devolve upon private child-protective agencies.

When the county board of child welfare began its work in 1917 the staff consisted of two social investigators and one stenographer. In 1924 the board employed a staff of five persons—a superintendent, two field agents, and two stenographers. The county was districted, and one field agent was assigned to each district. All records were kept in the office at the county seat.

The increasing appropriations for the care of children resulted in some criticism in the county and in 1924 led to a taxpayer's suit which resulted in a very thorough investigation of the board, its management, and every detail of its work for needy children. The county papers with one exception supported the findings, which clearly were a strong indorsement of the board and its work.

ACTIVITIES OF THE DUTCHESS COUNTY BOARD OF CHILD WELFARE

According to the report of the superintendent of the board of child welfare the board supported and cared for 531 children during 1924. Of this number 186 were cared for in their own homes through mothers' allowances (see p. 58), and 345 were cared for in boarding homes and institutions. It is stated further that these figures—

do not begin to express the actual number of children whose lives have been benefited by the work of the board. The children whose mothers, left widowed, have been shown a way to independence without financial help from the board; the children whose mothers are dead and for whom homes have been found where

¹² N. Y., General Municipal Law, sec. 152.

the fathers could support them; children whose parents have been advised as to their care, or warned against their neglect; children for whom homes have been found with relatives; delinquent children who have been guided; defective children for whom care has been found in State institutions or whose parents have been advised how to train them; sick children, discouraged children, lost children, runaway children, an endless stream of children who have been given more than what money could buy, to whom the board has given love and protection, guidance and warning, understanding and friendship.¹³

Although intensive case work with each of this considerable group of children is not possible with so limited a staff, acceptable standards of case work are maintained, and many individual cases show the thoroughness, resourcefulness, and versatility of the field agents. The ideals and performance of the agents compare favorably with those of the better private child-caring agencies of the country. As it is a public agency, the board can not limit its intake either as to numbers or as to types of difficulty. It must receive children requiring public support together with whatever problems they bring with them, and the problems must be solved with such resources as are available.

An attempt is made to avoid the breaking up of families, and aid to mothers (see p. 58) has been an important feature of the work.

CARE OF DEPENDENT AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN

During the year 1924 the county board of child welfare received 148 children as public charges. One-half of these were received by commitment from the court and one-half were accepted by the board through its own action. The number of children supported by public funds during the year (including those already under care of the board at the beginning of the year) is shown in the following table:¹⁴

Children supported by public funds during the fiscal year 1924, classified by time received and discharged and by committing agency, Dutchess County, N. Y.

Committing agency	Total children under care, fiscal year 1924	Children received—		Children discharged during fiscal year 1924	Children under care Oct. 31, 1924
		Before Oct. 31, 1923	During fiscal year 1924		
Total	352	204	148	155	197
Court	129	55	74	52	177
Board of child welfare	223	149	74	103	120

¹⁴ Four of these children were committed by the court but not made public charges.

The figures in this table indicate a situation very different from that found in the counties visited in Minnesota and North Carolina, where almost no children were supported by public money—except those whose mothers were receiving allowances. Of the 155 children in Dutchess County, N. Y., discharged from care in the year 1924 it was reported that 79 were returned to relatives, 35 were placed in free homes, 16 were sent to State institutions (principally to State

¹³ Proceedings of the Board of Supervisors of Dutchess County, p. 253. Poughkeepsie City, N. Y., 1924.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 257.

schools for mental defectives), and the remaining 25 were put in the care of private institutions or child-caring agencies. One hundred and sixty-one children were cared for in boarding homes. Owing to the small size of the staff the supervision necessary in making use of a larger number of boarding homes was not possible.

ASSISTANCE TO THE CHILDREN'S COURT

From the establishment of the children's court in November, 1922 (see p. 52), until January 1, 1924, the board of child welfare had assisted the court. It became responsible for taking complaints, delivering summonses, keeping and filing records, and making a detailed statistical report of the work of the court, as well as for making investigations and performing the duties of a probation officer. At the joint request of the judge of the children's court and the board of child welfare the board of supervisors appropriated a sum available on January 1, 1924, directly to the court for the salary of a probation officer. The court in pursuance of this action of the board appointed one of the trained workers of the board of child welfare to act as probation officer and general court assistant, and the closest cooperation between the two agencies continued to be maintained.

The board was the actual complainant in only 48 of the 412 cases brought into the children's court during the year, but the majority of the complaints were filed upon its recommendation. The board preferred to have the interested citizens who brought the situations to its attention carry them before the court whenever possible. Thus citizens of the county while helping to protect the children become more conversant with the child-caring processes and more interested in the board of child welfare and its aims. Such interest and understanding on the part of citizens are essential when public appropriations are to be secured. All but five of the complaints of improper guardianship made before the court were handled and investigated by the agents of the board, and 63 of the 73 children committed by the court during the year (not including 11 who were placed in free homes and later returned to public care) were committed directly to the care of the board.

ADMINISTRATION OF MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES

By the giving of aid to 51 mothers in their own homes during the year 1924 a total number of 186 children were assisted through this form of relief.¹⁵ The board has stated in its report for the year 1924 that "every family is expected to help itself as much as possible. There is no set amount of money given by the board for each child, but instead the needs of each family are worked out individually by a budget system. Any income which the family may be able to bring in by itself is then subtracted from the total amount of the budget, and the board makes up only the deficit."¹⁶ The board has stated:

Many of the applications for mothers' allowances are made before the applicants fully understand the qualifications necessary. A mother must not only be fit mentally, morally, and physically to care for her children; she and her family must also be in financial need. Most of the refusals to grant relief are based upon the fact that the families can get along without help. One able-bodied woman with only one child applied for help. While her husband was alive she had worked outside her home regularly, leaving her baby with a neighbor, but as soon as her husband died she applied for public support. It was

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 253.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 256.

refused because she could easily manage to support herself and child. Another woman with six sons and daughters over 16 applied for help in caring for two younger children. The board expects the older children to carry the burden of the family whenever possible, and of course no help was given in this case.¹⁷

COST OF THE WORK

The total cost of the work of the county board of child welfare to Dutchess County in 1924 was \$85,768.30. It should be noted that the total sum paid for the salaries of the staff during the year was less than the amount collected from parents and relatives toward the support of children under care. The expenditure was as follows:¹⁸

Purpose of expenditure	Amount expended
Support of children:	
Allowances to mothers	\$23, 514. 00
Board of children in families	8, 388. 57
Board of children in institutions (approximately)	50, 350. 63
Total	82, 253. 20
Refunds collected from parents toward support.....	6, 913. 97
Net cost of support of children.....	75, 339. 23
Administration:	
Salaries	6, 755. 49
Office expenses	1, 289. 64
Traveling expenses	2, 383. 94
Total	10, 429. 07
Total expenses for support and service to children.....	85, 768. 30

SIMILAR PROGRAMS IN OTHER COUNTIES

In 1921 the Suffolk County act was passed.¹⁹ It was similar to the Dutchess County act but contains one provision of some significance; namely, that the courts may commit children to public institutions or public agencies only. The officials of the county desired its board of child welfare to be its sole administrative agency in the care of children. (See p. 52.) The court therefore may send children to State institutions, transferring administrative responsibility to the State of New York; but otherwise it can commit only to the county board of child welfare, which then arranges for care of the child in a boarding home, a free home, or an institution according to his need.

In 1922 an amendment²⁰ to the law creating boards of child welfare to grant aid to mothers was obtained, which provided that any county might by vote of its board of supervisors adopt a county program similar to that in the Dutchess County act. It provided that the powers and duties of poor-law officials as they relate to the support of destitute children may be added to the duties of the existing boards of child welfare. This act does not particularize the duties of the board toward children as does the Dutchess County act, and it places no direct responsibility on the board for protecting neglected children. However, under the general poor-law provisions, children's needs can be met. As yet only one county—Cayuga—has adopted the system provided by the act.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 254.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 269.

¹⁹ N. Y., act of May 11, 1921, ch. 696, Laws of 1921, p. 2459.

²⁰ N. Y., act of April 10, 1922, ch. 546, Laws of 1922, p. 1252.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A.—SUMMARY OF DATA OBTAINED IN NINE COUNTIES IN MINNESOTA

COUNTY NO. 1

The first county visited by the representative of the United States Childrens' Bureau is a rural one, having somewhat less than 25,000 inhabitants. Its county seat, which has a total population of less than 10,000, is its only city. Railroad shops are its principal industry. The southern part of the county has rich soil, but the central and northern parts are in the main sandy and have numerous small lakes. Toward the northern end of the county is a range of hills where iron mines are worked and where many Austrians and Poles live.

A number of houses consisting merely of boards covered with tar paper were observed throughout the county. As winter dwellings in Minnesota climate these suggested positive suffering.

There are 34 townships in the county, each responsible for the care of its poor, but little "care" is given.

Some townships spend nothing for the support of the poor, and some are fairly liberal. The township supervisors (three in each township) administer whatever relief is provided. As a rule they arrive at decisions informally. Occasionally formal action is taken. The county board of child welfare through its executive secretary appeals to the various township boards when relief for a family is needed, usually, though not always, with success.

Some townships are practically bankrupt. Schools have been built which remain unpaid for and unused, and no poor relief can be got out of the townships. In many townships mines which did not pay had been opened. Expenses were incurred by the town during the boom, and then the people moved away leaving few to pay taxes.

Seldom does any township appropriate more than \$150 or \$200 a year as a poor fund to cover all calls for assistance. At least one township in the county had only a \$50 poor fund. The law provides for a tax of 1 mill on a dollar to care for the poor, but if a balance of \$50 is on hand a new levy is not required. To prevent a new levy none of the \$50 was spent. The county nurse told of having presented to one such board needy cases which absorbed the \$50; a new levy became necessary, and a larger poor fund resulted.

One family has been known to the local workers for a year and a half, and in that time it has moved from township to township. The children of this family are deplorably neglected, but no official has been found willing to grant public support for them.

There is no provision for the care of old people, and a case was cited of an old paralyzed man in a back room of a shack who was in a state of utter neglect. Formerly the county had an almshouse, and the county was the unit of poor-law and health administration. Ten years ago, however, the town system was adopted for both. The county institution was closed, and each township became independently responsible for the care of its poor.

In the county there has never been much organized private charitable effort. The Salvation Army has done something, but the churches have not actively entered the field. Various fraternal organizations give relief, and men's clubs help boys to stay in school and assist in other ways. An associated charities was organized some years ago and recently had been revived, but with no paid executive and no funds its field of service was problematical. The chamber of commerce had a welfare committee which had gone on record as in favor of doing away with the county nurse and with the farm agent.

This county was selected by the children's bureau of the Minnesota State Board of Control as one to be visited by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau because it had employed trained social workers as executive secretaries of its board of child welfare for several years. The visit, however, was made at a period of transition in its social service. The efficient chairman of

the board of child welfare had just moved from the county, and a new chairman as yet had not been elected. A new executive secretary, the third to fill the position, had been in the field only a few weeks. The county nurse recently had been transferred from the direction of the board of child welfare to that of the board of county commissioners. A recently elected juvenile-court judge was too ill to serve, and a judge from a near-by county was sitting.

The county board of child welfare.

The board of child welfare in this as in other counties consisted of three public-spirited citizens appointed by the State board of control, together with the county superintendent of schools and a member of the board of county commissioners designated by that board—in this case the chairman of the commissioners.

The first board of child welfare in this county was appointed in 1918, the impetus coming from a county child-welfare committee of the women's auxiliary of the Council of National Defense. The board of county commissioners appropriated \$500 with which to begin the work.

At first a county-welfare nurse was employed for a three-month period, additional money being raised privately for the purpose. At the end of three months the nurse was taken over by the American Red Cross. Not until September, 1919, was the board's organization perfected. Thereafter regular monthly meetings were held, and with the assistance of the county nurse and a city nurse the board undertook an active child-helping program, members of the board doing a large part of the necessary field work.

The chairman of the board was its leading spirit and was the most active in making investigations. A creditable report issued June 1, 1920, summarized the accomplishments as follows:

Type of work done or difficulty dealt with	Number of cases handled
Total	50
Delinquency	2
Neglect or cruelty	9
Unmarried mothers	10
Feeble-mindedness	5
Insanity	1
Mothers' pensions	5
Investigations ¹	8
Miscellaneous	10

At the request of the probate judge the board of child welfare investigates all applications for mothers' allowances, making recommendations to the court; and it also supervises the families to whom the court grants allowances.

The budget of the board of child welfare adopted in February, 1924, and passed by the county commissioners was as follows:

Salary of executive secretary	\$1,800
Stenographer	480
Other expenses not to exceed	480
Total	2,760

The executive secretary.

Early in 1921 the first paid executive was employed. She was a college woman with training and previous experience in handling child-caring problems elsewhere. In an informal letter to a friend this executive secretary gave a picture of conditions as she found them in 1921, as follows:

The county has a town system of outside relief. There is no county home for old people, nor is there any place in which to care in an emergency for children. The aged poor must bear whatever fate brings. In a township about 25 miles from the county seat is a man of about 45 years who is suffering from locomotor ataxia. He is a gigantic burden to his old father and a constant source of concern to the community. This man is ending his days in a corner resting on a cot covered with indescribably filthy bedding. The father is too old and weak to take care of this son and is not able to pay for his care.

¹Seven investigations were made for the State board of control and one for an agency outside of the county.

Cases of neglect abound. A family of 13 is found, the mother only 36 years of age. Although the home is poverty-stricken the lazy but able-bodied father prefers to serve periodical terms in the county jail to working for his family. He is said to be almost too lazy to light the ever-present cigarette. As no work is provided at the jail its atmosphere is not uncongenial to the man.

Another is a family of 11—the father a patient at a hospital on account of tuberculosis, the mother a thoroughly incompetent housekeeper unable to provide properly for her children from the funds made available by the county officials. The children in neither family are receiving such care as will insure good citizenship in time to come, but so far no remedial measures have been possible.

Illegitimacy is one of the big problems in the county. Real progress has been made through recent State legislation in establishing paternity in these cases and in compelling the fathers of children born out of wedlock to pay for their support and to take out insurance policies of not less than \$1,000 in favor of the children. The establishment of paternity, however, must be by court action, and as hearings are public rather than in chambers the ordeal is a trying one for young and sensitive mothers.

Feeble-mindedness, which often goes hand in hand with illegitimacy, is far more tangible and is quite readily established by mental tests; but the State needs institutions for the care of the feeble-minded, institutions for teachable and subnormal children, and for adults of the child-bearing age. It is like bailing the ocean with a sieve to attempt any program for this group without this fundamental equipment. Ten years ago in a thinly populated section of the county a girl of 14 years was traded by her mother to a man of 74 for a cow. This child wife was below par mentally. She now has three children who have survived the hardships of frontier life. A sick baby and a sick calf were found sleeping on the same bed, and the calf seemed to be getting the best attention. Two of the children are noticeably defective, and there is soon to be another baby. Nothing can be done, as the one State institution is hopelessly overcrowded.

This county has made a beginning. One social worker is in the county with a committee consisting of three excellent citizens and two public officials at her back. There is a State board which is stimulating such county organizations. Conditions are recognized, at least by some of the citizens, and progress may be expected, but it will be slow.

At the end of her first year's service (March 1, 1921, to March 1, 1922), this worker's report indicated the nature and extent of her activities and accomplishments to be as follows:

Number of families and children dealt with by the executive secretary in county No. 1, Minnesota, year ended March 1, 1922, by type of case

Type of case	Number of families and children dealt with					
	Under supervision Mar. 1, 1921		New during year		Under supervision Mar. 1, 1922	
	Families	Children	Families	Children	Families	Children
Total.....	39	67	49	96	54	119
Feeble-mindedness.....	6	16	6	11	6	16
Unmarried mothers.....	20	20	11	11	17	17
Dependency.....	6	15	13	44	15	50
Delinquency.....	6	6	7	7	10	10
Adoption.....			9	9	2	2
Neglect.....	1	10	3	14	4	24

The first executive secretary stayed in the field about two years, her successor stayed a little over one year, and the third was appointed on June 15, 1924. All three of the executive secretaries were social workers with some degree of experience. The first secretary consulted her board on each case; the second took more independent action.

Until the year before the visit of the agent of the United States Children's Bureau no stenographic help had been available, and the records therefore were meager and many of them poorly arranged, much of the essential information being in letters and copies of letters.

The division of responsibility between the State children's bureau and the county board of child welfare was somewhat puzzling. Much of the filed correspondence between them seemed to be an attempt on the part of one body to obtain such information as was known to the other. The executive secretary was expected to send to the office of the State children's bureau in St. Paul a copy of all case-work material, including both case histories and correspondence. As was inevitable under the pressure of work with limited office assistance, the executive secretaries had failed to do so. On the other hand, the State children's bureau, equally handicapped, had not always conveyed promptly to the county board such information as it had obtained. For instance, one letter dated November 2, 1923, asking for a report on a case stated that none had been received since October, 1921. At no point did the Minnesota system seem to present greater difficulty than in the practical carrying out of its principle of centralized responsibility and decentralized administration. Administration was confused as between the State and the county.

The card index of records in the office of this county board of child welfare showed current cases on July 1, 1924, as follows:

Type of case	Number of cases	Type of case	Number of cases
Total	158	Epilepsy	1
Adoptions	6	Feeble-mindedness	25
Boarding homes (babies)	2	Neglected	22
Applications for mothers' allowances	7	Placements	4
County allowances (supervision) ..	23	Unmarried mothers	29
Delinquency	10	Investigations for outside agencies ..	9
		Miscellaneous	20

The juvenile court.

The probate judge who sat as juvenile-court judge when the county board of child welfare first functioned was much interested in the work. Since his death the county has been handicapped, as his successor has been ill most of the time. The probate judge of a near-by county was acting as juvenile-court judge at the time of the visit of the representative of the United States Children's Bureau, visiting the county when occasion demanded. The district attorney was an intelligent and socially minded young lawyer, who apparently was the vital and determining factor in all legal matters relating to child welfare.

Children's cases were invariably heard in chambers, as the law required. No attempt had been made to collect support from parents for children who had been taken from them by court action. Usually children were removed from their homes only when they could be sent to the State school for dependent children.

The probate judge receives no additional salary as judge of the juvenile court, but a fee is paid to him for recording the proceedings in each case.

Protection of unmarried mothers.

The largest single interest of the board and its executive secretary was in the unmarried mothers and their babies and the work connected therewith.

It had become generally known that the district attorney had much to do with proceedings to establish paternity and that the executive secretary of the board of child welfare also was a person who gave assistance. Therefore unmarried pregnant girls and women or their relatives generally consulted one or the other of these officials, before the birth of the babies. The district attorney usually turned over the cases at once to the executive secretary. A first complaint was taken, and the executive secretary followed up the case, interviewing the man. Frequently the father of the child acknowledged paternity at once, later being formally adjudged the father after a hearing in court. An agreement as to the payment of the confinement expenses and future support of the child also was frequently arrived at before the formal hearing took place. Usually a cash payment of \$150 for confinement expenses was required and \$15 a month for the

support of the child until he was 16 years old. The district attorney of this county said they had difficulty in making collections. Ordinarily the court ordered the money paid to the State board of control. The county worker was asked to follow up the case when the man failed to pay. Delay in notification of arrears and the shifting of residences made it difficult to secure regular payments, yet further court action on account of nonpayment was rare. If the man could be found he was urged to renew payments, but nothing further was done.

Both the executive secretary and the county attorney stated they did not know how many of the men who had been ordered by the court to support babies had made regular weekly payments or over what period of time such payments had been made, as the payments usually had been ordered made to the State office. The secretary's records indicated that the whereabouts of the majority of mothers and children was known, and that in most instances mother and child were together. In a number of instances it was noted that the executive secretary had received word from the State children's bureau that a man had been in arrears for many weeks. In most cases it had not been possible to collect the accumulated amount even when the man was located.

It was stated that there has been no evidence that blackmail ever had been attempted in these cases, and but one instance was known of an innocent man's being held. In this instance conviction was based on perjured testimony. A pregnant girl named a man with whom she had been friendly as the father of the expected baby, and after a hearing the man was held. One of the chief witnesses was the girl's brother-in-law. The accused man protested his innocence, and while certain circumstances upheld him he was adjudged the father and was ordered to support the baby. After the trial gradually the finger of suspicion pointed to the brother-in-law. The accused man pressed the matter and in the end was able to prove the brother-in-law to be at fault. The girl repudiated her testimony, saying that the brother-in-law had intimidated her into swearing falsely. All persons interviewed recalled no other case in which the accused man had been—or even claimed to have been—entirely innocent in his relations with the girl, although he might have denied parenthood.

Another case involved the son of a prominent man. His family deposited \$1,200 in the bank in the girl's name, and the young man left town. As the \$1,200 could be spent by the mother for other purposes and the child left with no support the board members thought that paternity should be established judicially and the child should be insured support. Private settlements are not encouraged by the State board, as they are not deemed to furnish sufficient protection to the child.

The district attorney and the judge of the juvenile court were considering at the time of the visit of the representative of the United States Children's Bureau the case of a pregnant girl and a 17-year-old high-school boy responsible for her condition, without consulting the executive secretary of the board of child welfare or any member of it. Paternity had been acknowledged, and as the case presented no unusual problem the board of child welfare had not been notified.

Investigations for mothers' allowances.

In this county, as throughout the State, the juvenile court was granting the allowances to mothers before the county boards of child welfare were created, and the county attorney was responsible for the investigations. The law which provided for the establishment of county boards of child welfare directed that upon the request of the court they should "consider applications for allowance * * * and advise the court concerning their merit, the sum, if any, which ought to be allowed, and the special conditions, if any, upon which the same ought to be granted."²

In this county the board, soon after it was appointed, was requested by the court to make these investigations. The recommendations of the board almost invariably have been accepted by the court. So rarely has the court modified the recommendations of the board that there had been discussion as to the need of having such relief determined judicially, instead of administratively.

The county board of child welfare made no case-by-case report of mothers' allowances to the State board of control. But the case of any mother whose husband is in the penitentiary is reported to the State when the payment of a prisoner's wages to his family or its relief from prison funds is desired. Such payments are adjusted through the State parole agent.

² Minn., act of Apr. 14, 1917, ch. 223, sec. 4, Laws of 1917, p. 339 (Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 8674, p. 1189).

In the summer of 1924 the children of 25 families in the county (the large majority being widows with children) were receiving allowances averaging \$35 a month, as follows:

Amount received per family	Number of families	Amount received per family	Number of families
\$55-----	1	\$30-----	1
50-----	2	25-----	2
45-----	1	20-----	3
40-----	7	10-----	1
35-----	7		

The father of one family visited was physically incapable of supporting his family, having some spinal trouble which the record stated was due to arteriosclerosis. As his wife said that the doctor had advised him to drink 3 quarts of milk a day, to live in the open, and if possible to expose the spine to direct sun rays, the executive secretary supposed that tuberculosis of the spine might be present. The county nurse had called once, but the man had consulted neither doctor nor nurse recently. Although there also were small children the family used no fresh milk as they could not afford it, but used only condensed milk. The woman was not strong, and in the previous year had spent some time in a hospital. The executive secretary and the agent of the United States Children's Bureau felt that the small allowance granted this family was meeting only a fraction of its needs, and the secretary was planning further aid.

The judge asked the new executive secretary to reinvestigate the case of another mother who was receiving an allowance. She had five children under 14 years of age when the allowance of \$50 a month was made in June, 1923. The children were frequently tardy in school; the woman was said to be immoral and to be extravagant in the use of her money, purchasing nonessentials. She had failed to dry or can vegetables and berries when she might have done so, which was said to indicate a lack of thrift. Neighbors had complained that the woman should not have help. The representative of the United States Children's Bureau accompanied the executive secretary of the board of child welfare when the latter made her first visit to this family, which was found living with five other families in an abandoned mining village. Dozens of houses, including a bank and store buildings, were empty; and the nearest store was 2 or 3 miles away. The men in all but two families had gone away to work. In the family under investigation there was one child 14 years of age beside the five children under 14 years of age. A flourishing garden was being cultivated, the house was not bare although it was untidy, and there was evidence of an attempt to make it homelike. It seemed improbable that a woman inclined to increase her income by relations with men should select so isolated a spot. However, the executive secretary expected to follow up the rumors of misconduct and to study the situation further.

Care of dependent and neglected children.

Although each township is required to support poor persons for whom relatives can not care, no definitely recognized responsibility on the part of anyone for the support of needy children was observed. Unless a mother's allowance could meet the need or the child could be sent to the State school for placement in a free home there was no public provision for support; and no private child-caring agency existed in the territory. Children eligible for placement in free homes were sent to the State school for dependent children, which is responsible for both placement and supervision. The State school may refuse to receive a child thought to be unplaceable. A child rejected by the school is turned back to the county or township, which frequently refuses to make other provision for him, so that he must be returned to the place from which he came. The records of the county board of child welfare gave no indication of any placements in the county by outside agencies, and the new secretary knew of none.

It was said that children seldom were brought into court as delinquents. The county attorney stated that almost never was a case brought to the juvenile court except through the executive secretary of the county board of child welfare. Probation in these instances had been informal, the executive secretary of the county board of child welfare acting as probation officer.

Boarding homes have been used occasionally for children not eligible for admission to the State school. One newspaper request for boarding care for a baby brought 18 applications. Two babies were indexed as in boarding homes, but one of these was found to have been legally adopted long before, and the

other was with his grandmother. Each boarding home must be licensed by the children's bureau of the State board of control. The county board of child welfare or its executive secretary had made the investigations for the few applications for license within the county and had forwarded recommendations to the State board.

Promotion of school attendance and activity in regard to child labor.

The State makes no special provision for the enforcement of the compulsory attendance law in the county schools except that the law provides that the superintendent of schools and the county attorney are to enforce the law and that the bureau of women and children of the State industrial commission shall assist in its enforcement. Absences for unusual causes are reported to the county superintendent of schools, who writes to the parents. No prosecutions of parents under the education law have been put through the court in this county.

If a child lived 4 miles or more from a school "over good roads," the State allowed \$50 for his transportation, to be paid either to the school board or, by its designation, to the family of the child. School busses were operated in some parts of the county from such State funds. One consolidated school with 170 pupils had been built in the county, but it was expensive to operate and was unpopular among the taxpayers. There are two opportunity classes in the county seat.

The county had 114 school districts with 105 rural schools. One strip of land recently was found to be outside any school district, and children as old as 12 years in this part of the county had never been in school. After difficulty and with the help of the \$50 per child allowed by the State for transportation, arrangements were made to send the children to one of the near-by townships to school.

The executive secretary of the county board of child welfare was about to make a survey of school attendance in the county, this county having been selected as typical for this purpose.

In regard to enforcing the compulsory school attendance law the county board of child welfare has been active under its general powers. The board has no official responsibility for enforcing the child labor law, except as it is responsible for enforcing all child-caring laws. An efficient State industrial commission is said to look carefully after violations of the child labor law. The working certificates are granted by the superintendents of the schools.

County health work.

There was a nominal health officer in this county. When the county abandoned the county system of poor law and health administration 10 years ago the county health board and its officers were left with practically no duties.

The county board of health consisted of the chairman of the board of county commissioners, one person appointed by that board, and a third person selected by these two members.

Each township had a health officer appointed by the three township supervisors. He was not required to be a physician and usually was not. He was supposed to look after contagious diseases to the extent of posting the signs. Several townships might appoint the same person as health officer, and if a township selected no health officer the county health officer could act. The chairman of the board of county commissioners could not recall that money ever had been appropriated for salary or for expenses of the county health officer.

There were four hospitals in the county. The mines operated two of them, which also received patients from outside of the families of miners. A Catholic hospital and a Protestant hospital were in the county seat. A few beds for free patients were available.

There were a city nurse and a county nurse. The county nurse had worked under the direction of the county board of child welfare until recently, when she was transferred to the direction of the board of county commissioners.

A fairly well-defined movement had developed to do away with the county nurse and also with a farm agent, who was said to be doing good work in the county. The board of child welfare succeeded in preventing such action by the board of county commissioners. However, there is still evidence of opposition, and it was feared by interested persons that there might be a further attempt to dispense with the nurse or even with the board of child welfare.

The State department of health had organized a new county committee consisting of the chairman of the board of supervisors, the county health officer, and a physician and two women appointed by the board of commissioners to promote a maternity and infancy program. By June 30, 1924, no money had been paid

to the county from Federal or State funds. It was said that the State would assist with prenatal clinics and little mothers' classes and would furnish literature. But as the local nurses would have to follow up the work of the clinics in addition to attending to their other pressing duties they had not been able to take advantage of the offer. It was hoped that this county committee might eventually lead to the adoption of a county health program, but so far it had been inactive.

The nurses organized a tonsil clinic last year, local physicians performing the operations. In two days operations were performed on 39 children in a temporary hospital outfitted in a school building. On occasions the nurses have arranged for patients to go to a hospital and then have urged the township to pay the bills. The county nurse said that she had never had a township refuse, although at times she had to plead with the supervisors and convince them that the law provided that they must furnish medical care to the poor.

COUNTY NO. 2

The population of county No. 2 was somewhat less than 56,000, and the county seat (which was the largest city) had nearly 16,000 inhabitants. This county was rich and prosperous. There was nowhere the evidence of extreme poverty such as was observed in county No. 1. The soil was rich and productive, and the rolling fields were planted almost to the last inch with fine-looking crops of hay, grain, and corn. The county formerly had employed a farm agent, a home demonstrator, and a county nurse, but it had discontinued all three.

The county board of child welfare and the executive secretary.

The county child-welfare board seemed relatively unimportant and depended largely on its executive secretary, who did all the case work. The State board corresponded directly with her as its representative.

The executive secretary, a registered nurse, was the wife of the county health officer and the mother of five children. She had acted as county secretary of home service for the American Red Cross for several years, rendering nursing service during the influenza epidemic and during the war. When the county requested the appointment of a board of child welfare the State board of control selected her as one of its members. Later she resigned to accept the appointment of executive secretary. Her office was in her own home, which was in the smaller city of the county. She was an active, energetic, and intelligent worker. Only the orderly organization of her activities made possible her accomplishments. Her records were well written and up to date—but they were written each night after she had been in the field all day. The county appropriates only \$1,500 for the work of the child-welfare board, out of which the executive secretary is paid 60 cents an hour and is allowed 10 cents a mile for running a car which she owns. There was no disposition on the part of the board of county commissioners to increase the appropriation, although they whole-heartedly approved of the secretary and her work.

The activities of the executive secretary in the field of health are indicated by her having sent seven patients to the State tuberculosis hospital within the year, the county paying \$35 a month for the care of each.

Protection of unmarried mothers.

In this community, as elsewhere in the State, the work for unmarried mothers took a large part of the time of the agency. The operation of the law had become so well known that almost every unmarried pregnant woman was reported to the county attorney or to the executive secretary or personally applied to one of them. In some cases, however, the baby was as old as one year when the mother first became known. The county attorney immediately turned over all such cases to the executive secretary for preliminary review. Paternity was established whenever possible, and support was required by the court in suitable instances.

There was difficulty in collecting monthly payments, and the executive secretary believed lump-sum payments advisable whenever it was possible to collect them. Very few men had been brought back to court for nonpayment. In two years only two men have served the 90 days which the law prescribes as a penalty for nonpayment of a support order.

The executive secretary believes that a bond invariably should be required. Only occasionally in this county had a bond been taken. She stated that a number of men had left the county without paying. Usually \$100 or \$150 was required for lying-in expenses and \$10 to \$15 a month for the support of the

child. As a rule it was only when the judge named the State board of control as the guardian of the child that he ordered the payments for its support made to that board. There was fear that if money were paid to the State there might be delay in action in case the payments stopped or were belated. In the majority of cases the judge had ordered payments made to the county attorney, who immediately turned the money over to the executive secretary to disburse for the support of the child.

To illustrate the willingness of officials to cooperate in the handling of a case and their appreciation of a difficult social situation the executive secretary cited the case of an unmarried young pregnant girl working in a hotel. The executive secretary saw the girl, won her confidence, and learned that a brother was responsible. He was interviewed and at first stoutly denied the charge; but finally he confessed when he was told that confession would avoid the publicity which inevitably would follow his arrest. The district attorney, the judge, and the executive secretary arranged for a private hearing; and on the testimony of the girl and a plea of guilty on the part of the young man he was committed to the State reformatory for two years. No newspaper publicity resulted, and the nature of the charge remained unknown in his community.

Mothers' allowances.

The executive secretary reported that no cases of extreme poverty were known to her. The judge of the juvenile court had construed the law as permitting the granting of an allowance to a family having no more than \$100 per child in the bank and had set an arbitrary limit of \$400 per family. Nearly every family in the county except in the county seat was said to own its own home, and the mothers receiving allowances were no exception. The highest allowance paid was \$45 to a mother with seven children; the lowest was \$10 to a mother of one child. The usual allowances were \$20 for two children, \$25 for three children, and \$35 for five or more children. Frequently the executive secretary asked the officials to guarantee the rent in the city or to allow \$5 a month in groceries to the mothers' aid families. Such requests were made by the executive secretary, the mothers not appearing in the matter.

The city council of the county seat had a committee for the care of the poor, which used the county board of child welfare for the investigation of families receiving help and for their supervision. The policy as to type of persons receiving outside relief was being modified gradually, as were also the character and amount of relief given.

Care of dependent, delinquent, and physically handicapped children.

As the various town boards in the county never had failed to make an appropriation for the relief of any case presented to them by the executive secretary she had been able to arrange for the boarding of a few children. She had a list of 20 good boarding homes and was making use of 5 of them. Since most of the people in the county were Catholic the majority of the children handled were of that faith, and the priests of the various parishes rendered material help. A priest who had graduated from a school of social work had been located in the county seat until recently, and his influence in developing a social spirit still was felt throughout the county. The file of current cases showed the following:

Type of work	Number of cases
Total	239
Administration of allowances to mothers ³	92
Protection of unmarried mothers	45
Placements	25
Adoptions	5
Care of dependent and neglected children ⁴	8
Care of delinquents	30
Care of the physically handicapped ⁵	10
Miscellaneous	24

The executive secretary had placed a few children in permanent foster homes. She has investigated the placements made by institutions in her county and was

³ 80 of these mothers were receiving allowances.

⁴ One of these was blind.

⁵ One of these dependent children was the baby of a girl in the State training school for girls.

instrumental in removing several children who had been placed unsuitably. Very poor placing-out work had been done by the institutions, according to the executive secretary. Improvement has resulted from investigations of placements by the county board of child welfare as the agent of the State board of control. One case cited was that of a 9-year-old girl who was found setting out cabbage plants, the family seemingly having taken her for the work she could do. She was removed to a local orphanage. Two other children between 8 and 12 years of age were discovered in similar situations in the same neighborhood. In another foster family a 9-year-old girl attended school very irregularly and was poorly dressed. She was in only the second grade. The two children of her foster parents were well dressed and attended school regularly, the 12-year-old child being in the fifth and the 13-year-old child in the sixth grade. The foster child had been in this home three years. On receiving a report from the county board of child welfare the State board of control disapproved the home and ordered the institution that had placed the child there to remove her. In two months the child was placed again in the same home by the institution, and again the executive secretary removed her.

County health work and care of the aged.

The county health officer had few or no duties. The smaller city paid a physician \$300 a year to care for the poor. In the towns local physicians were paid their regular fees for attending the poor by order of the town board.

No county home was operated, but at the county seat there was a municipal home for old people. In other parts of the county the few old people needing support were boarded in the homes of relatives or friends.

Report of the executive secretary.

Perhaps the actual operation of the work in a typical Minnesota county can be told best by the secretary herself. The following is from her report for the year 1924:

JANUARY 15, 1925.

To the BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

GENTLEMEN: On January 1 the county child-welfare board completed the sixth year of its work with women, children, and defectives resident in the county.

Any expression of gratitude or appreciation on the part of the child-welfare board for the support and backing of the county commissioners during that time must necessarily be inadequate.

There has been no change in the organization or policies of the board during the past year. The executive secretary does the field work and keeps the records. She is paid for actual time and for mileage for the use of her own car.

* * * * *

There have been 12 meetings during the year, all in ———.

* * * * *

A regional conference of child-welfare boards of 11 counties was held in this county on October 21 and 22.

* * * * *

In May and June there was a survey of all mothers' pension cases, as a result of which 19 were discontinued, 8 reduced, and 3 increased.

Between January 1, 1924, and January 1, 1925, the child-welfare board handled 358 cases, of which 88 were carried over from the previous year. This makes a total of 270 new cases. Out of this number 103 had to do with mothers' pensions.

The number of mothers receiving aid on January 1, 1924, was 74. The number of mothers receiving county aid on January 1, 1925, is 70. The number of children being cared for on January 1, 1925, is 299, which is an increase of 38 over the previous year. The average cost of support per child per month on January 1, 1925, is \$7.34. The total county aid for widows in 1923 was \$21,541.35. The total county aid for widows in 1924 was \$21,963.40. In 1923, 36 of these widows lived in the city of ———; in 1924, 28 were residents of ——— [the same city].

It is the policy of the child-welfare board to ascertain every resource of these families before making a recommendation to the juvenile court on the amount to allow. Because of the increasing number of applicants, the board found it necessary to ask the cooperation of relatives, of city and village councils, and of societies and guilds in a proper apportionment of relief.

It is not the policy of the board to undertake the entire support of all these families. * * *

Case work with the unmarried mother is next in importance. Due to a better understanding of the laws regarding illegitimacy the establishment of paternity and the obtaining of support for the child are becoming much more frequent than in the past. The child-welfare board is guardian of the estates of four of these children and acts as agent in the collecting and disbursing of the support money for three others.

The total number of unmarried mothers visited by the board during the year was 84. Sixty were new cases, and 24 were held over from 1923. The average age of the unmarried mothers was 21 years and 7 months, the oldest being 27 and the youngest 16. The average age of the children's fathers was found to be 24 years and 5 months, and the average number of children in the home from which the mother came was 6. The average education was through the eighth grade for 1924, two of the mothers being college girls.

In many cases there is a history of delinquency in the girl's family. In five families there had been other illegitimate births, a history of immorality in three others, feeble-mindedness in two others, and in two cases the parents of the girl were public charges. One girl had a brother in—— (an institution for delinquent boys) and another girl had a sister in—— (an institution for delinquent girls).

Fifteen of the girls were not employed but lived at home on their parents. Thirteen were housemaids and 10 were waitresses.

In dealing with these cases the need for good boarding homes for special cases is apparent. Five illegitimate children are now being boarded in—— County, under the supervision of the child-welfare board.

The work with the juvenile court in the supervision of delinquent and neglected children consists of investigation and recommendation to the court and occasionally of placements. The child-welfare board has become a sort of clearing house for girls who do not get on well at home, girls who need decent employment, and girls who merely need warning and advice occasionally. Just at present the board has five girls placed in employment under supervision.

During 1924 the board located five runaways. With the assistance of the sheriff or local police three were returned to their homes without scandal or publicity, one was returned to an institution, and one located in a distant city reported to police authorities there.

During 1924 first attempts at outside supervision of the feeble-minded in the county were made. Four feeble-minded were placed in employment and are self-supporting, while two were allowed to remain with their families and are visited occasionally. Ten cases were committed to the board of control and five were taken to the State institution for feeble-minded. Four were returned to institutions or to place of residence.

Early in the year the board of control asked for a survey of placements made in the county prior to the appointment of a child-welfare board. Sixteen of these cases were visited and reported on. There was a total of 45 placement and adoption investigations made during the year.

There were 10 cases of physically defective given aid during the year. Two were assisted in obtaining State aid for the blind. Two were sent to the hospital for treatment for orthopedic defects. Two were referred to the department of reeducation for the disabled

and one is now learning millinery, while a crippled dependent child was placed in the municipal home in —— temporarily.

There were 82 investigations for outside agencies. * * *

Respectfully submitted,

—— COUNTY CHILD WELFARE BOARD

Executive Secretary.

COUNTY NO. 3

Of the counties visited the third showed the highest degree of definite organization and equipment for carrying on a program of child care through its county board of child welfare. The staff of trained and experienced social workers, the records, the office equipment, and everything pertaining to the work of this board compared favorably with those of the better private social agencies. The city within the county had a population of more than 200,000, and in the county outside the city there were nearly 16,000 inhabitants.

This county was not free from the confusion in administrative matters which generally is present in a county containing a large city. The mayor of the city was chairman both of the city council and of the city and county board of control, which helped the situation to some extent. The county had in 1924 three independent agencies for public care of needy children; namely, the city and county board of control, the county board of child welfare, and the juvenile court. These will be discussed separately in the following paragraphs.

The city and county board of control.

For the general care of the poor there had been created a city and county board of control consisting of six members, as follows: The mayor of the city, one person appointed by the city council, and one by the county commissioners, and three additional members selected by the first three. Members were appointed for two years and generally had been reappointed upon expiration of their terms. This board employed as executive secretary a man about 35 years of age who had no social case work training or experience. It had the management of the county general hospital and the county farm and administered the home (out-door) relief. For the work, including relief, money was appropriated by the county commissioners and collected through taxes, one-third from the city and two-thirds from the county. The city and county board of control submitted a budget to the commissioners, but within the limits of the budget it was in complete control of expenditures. No very detailed report of expenditures was made public. In 1924 about \$100,000 was expended on outside relief, the board making its own investigations. In its budget no distinction was made between expenses for overhead and for relief. The administration of the almshouse was said to be without graft but with little appreciation or consideration of the inmates' human needs aside from their physical necessities.

The county board of child welfare.

The board of child welfare was established in August, 1918. For three months, at its request, the united charities of the city handled its case work. At the end of three months, upon the urgent recommendation of the united charities, the board appointed an executive secretary, and on November 1, 1918, it began the direct administration contemplated by the law. Until an appropriation was secured from the board of county commissioners two members of the county board of child welfare personally met all expenses, including the salary of the executive secretary.

The county board of child welfare seemed to stand well in the community, and its executive secretary was a leader among social workers. There was but little criticism of its work. The members of the board had been well selected, and both as individuals and as a board they had influence in the county. Many persons believed that if a much-discussed consolidation of the city and county work could be effected a unified system of child care by the county-welfare board could be worked out.

Since January 1, 1919, the expenses of the board have been met entirely by public appropriation, and there has been the usual difficulty in getting an appropriation sufficiently large to provide an adequate staff. The staff included one executive secretary, three stenographers, one clerk and typist, seven field agents, two investigators for illegitimacy cases, one follow-up worker for unmarried

mothers and supervisor of children in boarding care, one worker for the feeble-minded, one investigator of adoptions and placements, and one worker for delinquency and behavior cases.

There were a total of 14 social workers in the field besides the executive secretary. The board hoped to obtain an appropriation for two additional workers in the ensuing year. The salaries of the investigators ranged from \$100 to \$150 a month. The majority of the staff were residents of Minnesota, but the executive secretary said this was accidental, as the question of favoring local persons when appointments were to be made had never been raised. The present staff included four members of the American Association of Social Workers and several who were eligible for junior membership in that organization. Four were college graduates and two others had taken some courses in college.

All cases were registered in the confidential exchange maintained by the social agencies of the city. The executive secretary stated that the principal activities of the board concerned unmarried mothers, placements, adoptions, and the feeble-minded. Cases requiring family relief were referred to the various private charities. The board had not been requested to assist the city and county board of control in administering public outdoor relief, nor had the juvenile court asked it to assist with the mothers' allowances.

The city had had a community chest for several years and a council of social agencies for a short time. The council included both public and private agencies, and participation in the community chest was not essential to membership. Institutions were invited to join and a number had done so, but their representatives seldom attended the meetings. The executive secretary of the county board of child welfare was chairman of the children's committee of the council.

The county board of child welfare from time to time has urged the city and county board of control to provide support for children who for one reason or another could not be sent to the State public school for free-home placement, and for the past five years this board had been paying for boarding care of so-called "unplaceable" children under the supervision of the county board of child welfare. In the summer of 1924 the board gave official notice that no children would be supported after January 1, 1925. Although created to care for the poor of the county, this board seemed reluctant to consider the support of destitute or neglected children a public responsibility.

The executive secretary of the child-welfare board was quick to seize upon this opportunity to secure a direct appropriation from the board of county commissioners for the support of needy children as part of the budget of the county board of child welfare. The mayor seconded her proposition and fortunately her plan succeeded, \$5,000 being set aside by the county commissioners for this purpose for the year 1925.

This appropriation enabled the county welfare board to care for a few children in boarding homes. It is the first instance in which a Minnesota county has made a lump-sum appropriation specifically for the support of needy children who can be provided for neither by a mother's allowance nor by commitment to the State school or other State institution. The appropriation is small, and private charitable agencies will continue to provide support for many such children; but the precedent has been set, and the county board of child welfare can provide for its wards more adequately.

With this appropriation for the support of destitute children the county board had become something more than a local representative of the State board of control. Should it eventually develop a child-protection bureau it will become to a still greater degree an administrator of county obligations in addition to performing the duties which have been placed upon it as a local representative of the State.

The juvenile court.

The juvenile court in this large county is presided over by a judge of the district court designated for the purpose. At the time this county was visited by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau the judge had presided over the court since it was first organized. The court had one chief and eight other probation officers and two or three stenographers, and it used volunteer "big brothers" as well.

This court granted the allowances to mothers and made its own investigations. It had a mothers' aid department, "well staffed," the judge stated. It was independent of all other agencies in the county. An advisory committee organized by a former chief probation officer was still functioning.

The judge believed that mothers' allowances should be administered only after judicial determination. He thought that unpaid boards such as the county board

of child welfare mixed the practical with the theoretical and could not be held to as strict accountability as could a court. He expressed the opinion that the actual administration of the allowance and the supervision of the family receiving it might possibly be handled by some administrative bureau such as the county board but that the "right of a woman to participate in public funds is a matter for judicial determination." As this form of assistance is on a quasipermanent basis, he believed it should be granted only after specific findings. "The report of a probation officer is evidence," he said, implying that the observations of other social workers could not become evidence. In this judge's opinion the court system of distributing mothers' allowances—though most judges would be glad to get rid of it—was more satisfactory to the taxpayer, who felt that his money was being more carefully expended.

Children frequently had been committed by the court to the care of the united charities of the city or to other private agencies, as there was no definite provision in the county for the care and support of destitute or neglected children. The united charities cited the case of a badly diseased 15-year-old negro girl who was turned over to it by the court just before noon on a Saturday morning (which was just before the closing time of the agencies). No public funds were available for such cases and the private societies had difficulty in providing for them.

Protection of unmarried mothers.

The staff of the county board of child welfare devoted from one-third to one-half of their time to the problems of the unmarried mothers. About 500 new cases a year were handled. About 10 per cent of the illegitimacy complaints were made first to the county attorney and the other 90 per cent came directly to the county child-welfare board. The county attorney invariably referred such cases to the county board for investigation.

The procedure in these cases was as follows: First the girl was interviewed. If the child was as yet unborn a clinic physician made an examination and the necessary tests so that the mother would be ready for admission to a hospital for confinement care, which care was arranged for when necessary. Her statement was taken and the man named was interviewed at once, unless there was good ground for believing he would leave the State. Perhaps 5 per cent of the men have tried to get away after the interview, it was said, although they always were told that they would get a square deal. Rarely has a man brought into court denied having had illicit relations with the girl. Even in these occasional cases the men frequently changed their statements later and pleaded guilty. In not over 1 in 10 cases was a man held on the evidence of others only, for in 90 per cent of the cases they acknowledged paternity before the formal court hearing took place. The adjudication is then simple. The law requires that the State board of control or the county board as its representative must be in court at the hearing and make its recommendation. The county board in the county under consideration comes to its own decision in each case but consults the State children's bureau when in doubt. The court orders support money paid to the State board of control or to the county board of child welfare according to circumstances. If the child or mother is not in the county the county board usually asks that payment be made to the State board. If the court orders the money paid to the county board that body follows up the collections and disburses the money; if payment is to the State board, the State board is expected to attend to the collecting and disbursing in most cases.

The average payment ordered is \$15 or \$20 a month. In addition the man usually is held for \$100 or \$150 for the lying-in expenses of the mother. In only three cases in six years have lump sums been collected. In one of these a man from out of town had paid about \$1,000 under the original court order, and then a settlement for an additional \$2,000 was made by the State board of control, to be paid in yearly installments at the rate of \$350 a year. The last installment was paid in 1922. Few men of property or with money behind them have been involved in these proceedings; most of the men have been laborers or have had only transitory employment. If the men or their families have property payment was usually made to the State board of control. The State then paid the money over to the county board, which dealt with the mother. Paternity could be established either in the county where the girl or the man resided or where the baby was found if it was likely to become a public charge. Nearly all the girls remained in the county where they had previously lived. It was said that fewer than 10 per cent of the babies were sent out of the county, and then usually they were sent to relatives or friends.

Representatives of the county board regretted that not more than 50 per cent of the city mothers had kept the babies with them after the required three-month

nursing period. If a girl's people were in the county the welfare board usually could persuade them to take the baby. It was stated that the separations were due largely to the types of work open to the girls. Most of the girls would prefer to keep their babies with them but found it difficult to arrange. There was said to be need for socially operated boarding places where baby and mother could be boarded together. The county welfare board felt that it was doing fairly well with the handling of these cases up to and including the three-month nursing period but that there was need for better-organized and more extended aftercare.

The members of the staff of the State children's bureau stated that in their opinion a fair proportion of the unmarried mothers in the higher occupation level—as teachers, nurses, and students—had come to their attention. Few mothers were “repeaters,” as indicated by the records, and a number of the mothers married later. The superintendent of one of the maternity hospitals, on the other hand, saw no reason to think that second illegitimate children were uncommon; she too thought that the hospital received a due proportion of well-to-do unmarried mothers.

A lawyer who had long been a member of the county board of child welfare spoke at length of the illegitimacy law. He stated that the county board did not try to be either a moralizing or a reforming agency, but that it had been instrumental in solving some of the minor problems of the community. Through the process of licensing as provided by State law it had done away with “the abortion mills” and baby farms. Confinement care was now given in sanitary and supervised places. In his judgment illegitimacy was increasing and probably would continue to increase. He stated that only the unmarried mothers who could least well help themselves were coming to the knowledge of the county boards. Illicit relations occurred among the well-to-do, he thought, but either births were prevented or confinement arrangements were made without the State's learning about the greater number of them.

To his knowledge in no case as yet had the question of the inheritance of an illegitimate child come to court under the provision that such child should inherit from a father “who in writing and before a competent attesting witness shall have declared himself to be the father.”⁶ So far as he knew no effort had been made to secure such written acknowledgment.

He believed the county-board plan was working satisfactorily and with a minimum of expense, and he considered that the major problems were the weeding out of the unfit and the prevention of their increase by sterilization. Another member of the county board of child welfare was satisfied that the board was doing good work and that it had the respect and confidence of the people of the county.

Care of dependent, neglected, and delinquent children.

The county board made all the investigations in regard to placing out and adoption within the county that were required of the State board of control. Every placement in a free home in the county, by whatever agency made, was supposed to be reinvestigated; but because the staff was small the executive secretary of the board used her discretion as to procedure. Some investigations were much more complete than others, as the standards of the placing agencies varied. Investigations of 66 placements were made in the year ended June 30, 1924. Representatives of the State children's bureau also may visit the foster families but seldom or never do so. Having a local board reinvestigate the placements made by the private agencies licensed to do such work apparently caused no serious difficulty.

Investigations for 79 legal adoptions were made during the year. In many instances relatives were adopting the children. The court had granted only one adoption against the advice of the county board. Later the child in the case was brought into court on the ground of personal abuse by the foster parents and was removed from them.

The records in adoption cases indicated that the provision of law which permitted legal adoption only after the child has been in the home for six months had been construed as giving the investigating agency that period in which to visit the home and report. Visits and recommendations relating to adoptions were made at any time between the day of placement and the end of the six-month period. No investigation was made at the end of the period to observe conditions then existing and to estimate whether the arrangement was apt to be permanently satisfactory. One record examined showed approval of adoption by the State board of control on July 3 following the placement on June 2.

⁶ Minn., Gen. Stat. 1923, sec. 8723, p. 1197.

Another approval was dated May 5 when the placement had been made on January 23. In both cases the notice read that the approval of the State board of control was given for adoption when the six-month residence required by law should have elapsed.

During the year ended June 30, 1924, the county board of child welfare investigated 62 boarding homes and three maternity homes applying to the State for license. Reports with recommendations were made to the State board of control in each case.

The council of social agencies appreciated the need of a child-protective agency and were recommending that a protective department be created in the county board of child welfare. A humane society established many years ago was limiting its activities largely to the protection of animals. The council had used its influence to get an appropriation for the organization of protective work by the county welfare board, but so far it had been unsuccessful.

The year's report showed the board to have handled 230 cases of dependency or neglect and 85 cases of delinquency or incorrigibility, although seriously handicapped by lack of satisfactory provision for the care and support of such children. These children seemed to have come to the attention of the board in more or less incidental fashion and not as the result of a definite public program for their care. With the new appropriation, however, the status of these children will be more clearly defined, and the board will be better able to plan for their welfare.

The feeble-minded.

Ninety-four new cases of feeble-mindedness were reported to the county board during the year. The persons most obviously feeble-minded were taken before the probate court by the county board and committed to the guardianship of the State board of control. The county board assisted the State board in supervising all cases left in the community, one member of the staff being designated for the purpose.

COUNTY NO. 4

The population of this county was about 13,000. When visited by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau its county board of child welfare had been organized less than a year. Its chairman was a banker who had given much time to the work. Its secretary was the county superintendent of schools, who had also given both time and energy to it. Only about 25 cases had been handled, and 7 or 8 had been closed at the time of the visit. It was stated that no case had been heard by the juvenile court for several years prior to the board's appointment. The two women members of the board were active and made such investigations as were assigned to them. No attempt had been made to introduce formal case records. Correspondence and notes on each case were kept in a box file until the case was closed, when the material was put in a jacket in a filing drawer belonging to the county superintendent of schools. A half dozen mothers' allowance cases had been investigated at the request of the court.

The county allowed expenses and paid the modest bills presented by the board. Formerly the county had an American Red Cross nurse who worked in the schools, but at the time of the visit there was no nurse and no medical school inspection in the 69 rural schools. A county physician was paid for any poor case he was asked to attend by the county commissioners, but probably not more than two or three patients a year had been referred to him. No agency furnished clothes or shoes to school children, even when their own people could not do so, and no formal school-attendance work was provided for. The county had about 10 unmarried mothers under supervision.

The representative of the United States Children's Bureau with the field representative of the Minnesota children's bureau attended a meeting of the county board of child welfare. The secretary made a brief note of each case discussed in a book kept for the purpose. The cases discussed at this meeting seemed to typify the work of any county board. Note was made of each, as follows:

Mrs. C—— was assigned to call on a girl working in the hotel who had been named by a boy at a State clinic as the source of an infection. An informal discussion revealed a rumor concerning another girl which had reached the

ears of two or three members of the board and Mrs. C—— was asked to see this girl also. The same lady reported that an unmarried mother whose case was of long standing had married some time ago, and had had a second child since her marriage. The State had regularly forwarded to Mrs. C—— the money for the support of the first child, but as the mother did not now need it Mrs. C—— was depositing it to be held in trust for the child. No reason was suggested as to why the fund should not remain in the State treasury as in other similar circumstances.

The chairman reported that he and the secretary had looked into the circumstances of a mother who had been arrested for "moonshining." The father was dead and there were four children—a girl of 15, a boy of 12, and twins of 3 years. Because of the children the mother had not been held. She had said that those interested need not worry about the children as "they wouldn't touch liquor no matter how much of it was around." On the recommendation of the board \$15 a month was allowed the woman by the county commissioners for the support of her children, on the promise that she discontinue her illegal business.

A child whose mother was dead and who was living with the grandmother had been visited by the chairman, and on his recommendation \$10 a month was granted by the county commissioners to the grandmother for the child's care.

A bill for the care of a girl during confinement in another county was to be collected from her people if possible; if they could not pay, then from the county if the officials could be induced to pay it. A board member was assigned to see the family. Paternity could not be established in this case.

One member reported the commitment of a feeble-minded child which had been pending at the last meeting of the board.

The family of a man recently sent to the penitentiary was to be visited and then referred to the parole department, for help through the prison relief fund.

An unmarried mother whose baby was born in February, 1924, had not yet (in July) instituted proceedings to establish paternity. She named a 17-year-old neighbor, but had written letters to several other boys asking for money, claiming that each was responsible for her condition. The girl's mother was willing for proceedings to be entered, but the father was unwilling. The father was to be interviewed again.

The rumor of still another pregnant girl had reached the ears of three board members. The girl was said to be in a hospital in Minneapolis. This case would come to the board later, it was said, through the report of the hospital to the State board when the baby was born.

One board member had been told of another unmarried mother whose baby had been born in May. She was asked to visit the girl.

Another case was referred to in which the court had declared a man to be the father and had ordered him to pay, but nothing had ever been paid. A board member was to go with the girl to the court to see what could be done to compel payment.

Probably none of these cases would have received attention in this particular community had there been no board of child welfare. The board leaned heavily on the district representative who was present. As indicated above, board members had taken action in but few cases on their own initiative. Thorough case work could not be expected, at least until the board members had passed through a much longer period of guidance and supervision. However, many individuals had been benefited by the assistance of the board.

COUNTY NO. 5

This county has between 15,000 and 16,000 inhabitants. The agent of the United States Children's Bureau accompanied the field representative of the State children's bureau to the county seat, where certain cases were to be heard in the juvenile court. The situation proved a sordid one, and it is reviewed here because it illustrates how local boards can take action with the help of the State. Without the board there was no reason to believe the situation would not have remained entirely unchecked. It involved the immorality of a number of girls and boys, discovered through a single report of a city maternity hospital to the State board of control. A girl who had entered a city hospital for treatment following an induced abortion was also suffering from a venereal infection. As the girl came from this near-by county, in which there was a board of child welfare but no social worker, the field representative of the State children's bureau personally began the investigation. She consulted the field agent of the venereal-

disease department of the State board of health, and a serious situation was disclosed. Names were secured of more than half a dozen girls 13 to 17 years old and of an equal number of boys and men (including one married man) who were infected or had been exposed to infection through the various relations which had occurred. Under the health law it was the duty of the agent of the board of health to follow up each possible infection, purely as a health measure. On the other hand, the State board of control as a social agency was interested in cleaning up the situation. The two worked together effectively.

The chairman of the county board of child welfare had assisted in gathering data and was present at the court proceedings. He was a fine type of young business man, very outspoken, but discreet. While he was willing to give time to the social betterment of the town in which his children were to grow up he said he would be unwilling to serve as chairman more than one year, as the work was absorbing too much of his time.

The judge of the juvenile court was hearing the first case when the field representative of the State children's bureau and the agent of the United States Children's Bureau arrived. A 15-year-old girl, her mother and father, and the chairman of the county welfare board were in the room.

The mother admitted that each of her two older daughters had had an illegitimate child, but resented mention of this fact because one of the daughters was now married and of good reputation in the community. The father was somewhat rough but honest appearing, with a much clearer appreciation of the situation than the mother showed.

The 15-year-old girl had been in the habit of coming and going as she pleased, staying out over night and not telling her parents where nor with whom she stayed. That she was willing to tell the judge no more than she told her parents was evident, but she admitted having had immoral relations with several boys. The judge asked her whether she would talk more freely if only her father and mother were in the room. Her reply was, "I don't care." Thereupon the judge asked all other interested persons to withdraw.

Judgment was rendered with no further consultation of the chairman of the county board of child welfare nor of the field representative of the State board of control. The girl was sentenced to the State home school for girls, but sentence was suspended and she departed with her parents, the judge ordering her to go out with her parents only and to be home at 9 o'clock each night. The judge said later that in chambers the girl had given no further facts and had refused to answer his questions. He added that as the mother had been unable to protect any one of her three daughters in the past the chance that his plan would work well was doubtful, but he thought it worth trying. No formal probationary oversight was arranged by the court.

When the second case was called the county superintendent of schools and the field worker of the State department of health also were present.

The second 15-year-old girl talked freely, admitting with a smile of self-appreciation her relations with numerous boys, that she was diseased, that in spite of warning she had been with a number of boys since her infection, and that her medical treatments had been neglected. When asked by the judge how many boys she had been with since she knew she was diseased she said she did not know but thought she might be able to count them up. This girl's mother was dead; an older sister of good reputation was present. She had tried to bring up the younger sister properly, but she herself was married to a brutal sort of man who she reluctantly admitted had been cruel to her, twitted her with her sister's wrongdoing, and, she felt, he would not be above taking advantage of the sister. The father was also present. He was a weak individual and was said to be living with a woman in Minneapolis. His only plan was to have this young girl live with his brother (a man of somewhat questionable reputation) and take care of their father, who had just passed his one-hundredth birthday. As no protection or real supervision could be assured the girl was sentenced to the State home school for girls.

Before the hearing, the plan of the field representative of the State board of control had been to suggest that sentence be suspended for this girl and that she be placed under the supervision of a "big sister" in one of the Twin Cities. The girl's attitude on the stand, however, and her apparent feeling that she had gained enviable distinction, her smile as she recited her exploits and those of the other young people, gave no promise that such a plan would be feasible, and the suggestion was withheld.

The delinquencies of this girl, her sister, and their companions had almost invariably occurred at the lake resorts to which six or eight would go in an

automobile, later separating into couples. Liquor figured in the cases. The dance halls at the lake resorts were the principal recreation points for the young people, and they, with the general use of automobiles, were a source of real danger.

The girl whose abortion had brought the situation to light was to have been in court also, but she had left her home the night before. Her mother, an overdressed, hard-faced woman of doubtful reputation, was in court, but claimed to know nothing of the daughter's whereabouts. The State representative recommended to the board of child welfare that this woman's younger children be taken from her on charges of neglect or improper guardianship as the 13-year-old daughter had been a member of one of the automobile parties mentioned, her companion being a married man of the town who on that occasion had furnished the liquor.

The resort cited in the above cases had been much complained of. In the afternoon following the hearings that have been described two members of the town board from the township in which it is located came to talk the situation over with members of the welfare board. The place was licensed by the town board and could not operate without such license. The town board was divided as to the advisability of revoking the license. The two town-board members claimed that the man who operated the resort desired it to be clean, that his patrons brought their flasks and neither he nor the town board was able to control the situation because the county was responsible for policing the place. As many as five deputy sheriffs were sometimes sent to the resort on Saturday nights, but they were not very zealous in enforcing the law. They were on duty only until midnight, and the worst disorders occurred after that time and on the roads leading to the place. The county paid each deputy sheriff \$5 a night to no purpose at all so far as law enforcement was concerned, according to the town-board members.

Others among Minnesota's numerous lake resorts were said to present similar problems, and some were said to be plague spots. The law governing dance halls was intended to control such situations. It seems evident that local licensing of the place described, with county policing, was not working well. The conference with the welfare board, however, was significant of the influence these county boards may exercise.

The judge of the juvenile court, the chairman of the county welfare board, the superintendent of schools, and the field representative of the State children's bureau and of the State board of health held an informal conference to determine what should be done in following up the cases of the other young girls and boys and young men of the town who had been associated with those whose cases had been considered by the court.

The judge seemed reluctant to have the condition stirred up just before election but said he would hear any cases brought into court. He expressed his desire that the county should have a good agent on full time to help with the children's cases. He had as probation officer an old gentleman who in his opinion did excellent work, but it was noted that the possible usefulness of the probation officer in any of the situations discussed was not suggested.

One case discussed at the conference was of a family of 8 children 16 months to 12 years of age. The mother was of low mentality and also insane, having once been in the hospital for insane. The father was not very bright, and it was said that neither parent could give proper care to the children. They owned a home, worth about \$4,000, but with a \$2,000 lien on it. The house was bare, but a tractor and a touring car were among the family possessions. The case had been in the juvenile court two years before (in April, 1922), when the family promised to "fix things up." It was decided that if conditions did not improve the case was to be brought into court again.

Another case mentioned was of a one-legged mother with three or four children. The father and some of the children, it was said, had tuberculosis. One of the children had bad tonsils, and the school-teacher had written about the need of treatment, at the same time reporting the home conditions as very bad. A board member and the State field representative had called on the family. The mother had promised to have the child reexamined but had not done so. Possible court action was discussed, but no further plan was made to deal with the various family difficulties.

A 5-year-old child with a clubfoot was also spoken of. The family had failed to bring the child for examination as instructed and was to be called on again before court action was inaugurated.

The need of a resident social worker experienced in case work was illustrated in the last two cases. Patient day-by-day treatment of all the difficulties indi-

ated was not contemplated, court action being the main remedy suggested. However, even with the lack of such a social worker, a beginning had been made in arousing a public consciousness of the social ills of the community, and a number of these ills had been put in the way of being cured.

COUNTY NO. 6

The representative of the United States Children's Bureau talked to the probate judge of this county about his experience as judge of the juvenile court in his own county and in a county in which he was holding court during the illness of the local judge.

His own county retained the county system of poor relief and a county old people's home. The judge considered the county system more simple, fair, and efficient than the township system, and much more easily administered. This judge frequently made his own investigations but used members of the board of child welfare of his county on occasions. There was no paid executive secretary in his county, but he felt that the board probably would do better work with one. The judge was much concerned and bewildered by the illicit relations of the young people. He had tried several carnal-knowledge cases involving high-school boys and girls. The visitor suggested that boys of juvenile-court age might be brought into the juvenile court as delinquents instead of being tried on the criminal charge. The judge eagerly accepted this suggestion, saying he was sorry for the adolescent boys and thought too little sympathy sometimes was shown them.

The judge noticed that in his own county mothers' allowances were not granted on so generous a scale as in the county he was visiting. The widows in his county usually owned 40 acres of land, a cow or two, chickens, etc. In the other county they were left with nothing at all in the way of property or resources and so required larger pensions.

The new county home in his county is a modern building on the outskirts of the county seat, in place of the old, inaccessible farm formerly used. It never had more than 14 or 15 inmates, he said, and the old people now were happy and well cared for.

COUNTY NO. 7

The secretary of the county board of welfare was said to be the backbone of the board. She lived in the county seat, handled all the court work, and assigned the other work to the various members of the board living in different parts of the county. She was a college graduate, had taught, and was secretary of the county chapter of the American Red Cross during the war. A forceful woman of wide interests, she gave talks to farm bureaus, at county picnics, and wherever an audience was offered, in order to popularize the work of the board. When the board was first appointed the field representative of the State board of control gave advice in each situation, meeting with the board monthly; but such close supervision had become unnecessary, although the board still welcomed advice. The field representative of the State bureau said that boards in some of the other counties had not got hold of the work so well—largely, in her judgment, because of the personnel. In her experience the success of boards usually depended upon some one member's interest and ability.

Out of 12 new cases of unmarried mothers in two years in this county paternity was established in 9. Lump-sum settlements were made in 3 cases, 2 babies died, and monthly payments were ordered in 4 of the cases. In all but 1 case collection had been made regularly.

COUNTY NO. 8

This county, with a population of more than 16,000, was the first one in the State to ask for a child-welfare board. The present director of the children's bureau of the State board of control was probate judge of the county at the time the law was enacted. Previous to his election to the judgeship he had been superintendent of schools of the county for eight years. In 1911 he became probate judge and judge of the juvenile court. In 1913 he began the administration of mothers' allowances. Upon passage of the bill providing for county boards of child welfare and before it became operative he pressed for the appoint-

ment of such a board in his own county. A board was appointed and had organized ready to begin work when the law became effective on January 1, 1918. The county had an executive secretary from the first. In the beginning the executive secretary was paid entirely from American Red Cross funds, but for 1923-24 the county appropriated \$600 for the work, although the county commissioners at the same session economized by cutting off appropriations for the county nurse and for the farm agent. The commissioners made an appropriation of \$900 for the year July 1, 1924, to June 30, 1925. The American Red Cross still pays that part of the salary and expenses not covered by the public appropriation.

COUNTY NO. 9

In this county, with a population of between 15,000 and 16,000, the three women members of the county board of child welfare had spent their time building up public opinion in favor of a paid worker but had made no attempt to undertake case work.

Their first appeal to the board of county commissioners for an appropriation for an executive secretary was unsuccessful, and the board of child welfare was abolished. The influence of the three members, however, has continued, and they are determined to see the work properly organized in their county. As a step toward it they were conducting a campaign for the election of a good judge of probate who as juvenile-court judge would be in a position to influence the child-caring situation.

APPENDIX B.—SUMMARY OF DATA OBTAINED IN THREE COUNTIES OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY NO. 1

The first county visited by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau is a rural county containing somewhat less than 300 square miles. It has nearly 23,000 inhabitants, almost one-half of whom are negroes. There were fewer than 100 persons of foreign birth in the county. The county seat is a small city with a population between 5,000 and 6,000. Two mill districts immediately adjoin the city, with a population about equal to that of the city itself. Five small cotton mills were operated by a single company in the vicinity of the city. Mill wages ran as high as \$16 or \$18 a week. The mills owned houses which they rented to their employees at the rate of 25 cents per room per week. The mill houses were in various states of repair, some of them having badly broken floors and walls; but all those visited were extremely clean, and nearly every one of them was decorated with a bouquet of flowers—usually in a milk bottle. It was said that the mill people had the opportunity to buy their own homes, but few availed themselves of it. The mill population shifted in and out of the county.

There was one truck factory which paid good wages and furnished a good type of factory house. One industrial company in the town employed negroes at \$2.50 to \$3 a day, and many of these negro laborers owned their homes. Two other companies employed only negro operatives.

The farms were operated largely by tenants who moved from farm to farm. The tenant usually cultivated a bit of land on a percentage of one-half or one-fourth of the crop, according to whether fertilizer and team were or were not furnished to him. Tobacco and cotton were the principal crops. Garden truck, even for the home table, until recently had not been largely raised by the farmers. The farm agent and the home demonstrator had encouraged the raising of home vegetables and established a curb market in the city for the country people. This had proved very successful and had stimulated the raising of vegetables both for home consumption and for marketing. Life in the community seemed to be very simple.

The county superintendent of public welfare and board of public welfare.

This county is one of those not required by law to employ a full-time superintendent of public welfare (see p. 34), but for the past three years a full-time superintendent has been employed. The present superintendent was recommended for the position by the State commissioner of public welfare and was appointed by the county commissioners and the county board of education as provided by law.

The superintendent of welfare looked after any child reported as in need for any reason. She recommended action to the board of county commissioners in such instances as required the expenditure of public funds, and the commissioners had agreed to whatever recommendations she had made. However, she was modest in her demands and at times hesitated to ask for as large an expenditure as she believed the circumstances of a family made desirable. Destitute children who required support away from their own families were boarded out, or placed in free homes, or occasionally sent to private children's institutions. Very few children were taken under care because of destitution. The superintendent stated that there was little extreme poverty in the county. She believed that any family owning a cow could "make a crop," and with little or no rent to pay and wood in plenty they could live. Under the law any child could go to the county almshouse with his mother, but for many years past no children have been cared for in that way. Not many illegitimate children have come to the attention of the present superintendent of public welfare. Under the law babies must remain with their mothers during their first six months of life unless a separation is approved by the county superintendent of health and the judge of the juvenile court. The superintendent stated that only two or three babies had been separated from their mothers to her knowledge since she had held the position.

The board of public welfare, consisting of three citizens appointed by the State commissioner of public welfare, had been holding meetings very irregularly. Individual members, however, had been useful and were frequently consulted by the superintendent of welfare, who felt that her work would be much less effective if she did not have the interest and influence of the board. The superintendent had organized in each school district a committee of three to which she appealed for information, advice, and help. The county board of public welfare did not appear to be a vital force in the community although it doubtless could marshal public opinion if occasion demanded. The superintendent of public welfare, on the other hand, held a commanding position in the community. She was universally known, and her decisions as to what should be done in any given case seemed to be questioned by no one.

Assistance to the juvenile court.

The judge of the juvenile court had held the position since its creation, having been clerk of the superior court of the county for many years. He was genuinely interested in the welfare of children brought before the court and gave a good deal of time to consideration of the wisest disposition to make in each case. The superintendent of public welfare knew about and assisted with all court cases and in fact was responsible for bringing the majority of them to the attention of the court. The judge disliked to make a court record in any case involving a child. He therefore handled as many child difficulties as possible in an informal way in order to avoid the necessity of a court record. Only when the evidence overwhelmingly supported a charge against a child was formal action taken. In the majority of cases the child was turned over to the superintendent of public welfare for supervision, and thus probation was informal in almost all instances. A few cases of improper guardianship had been brought to the children's court, but the judge stated that the home conditions must be pretty bad before he was willing to take the children away from their parents.

Care of dependent and physically handicapped children.

The superintendent of public welfare did a good deal of more or less informal child placing. When a family had to be broken up or when children had to be removed from their families temporarily, she encouraged relatives to take the children or persuaded people she knew to do so. During nearly three years that she had been in office, she had sent but four children to the Children's Home Society of North Carolina for placement. Three of these were from two notoriously immoral families, and the fourth was the illegitimate premature baby of a girl of 18. As this girl could not nurse the baby and both she and her parents were determined to dispose of him, the physician ordered his removal for his own safety, and the superintendent took him to the children's home, where he later died in convulsions. Occasionally the superintendent paid the board of a child in a suitable family home. She stated that she selected "good Christian homes where the folks would love the children and let them play."

Soon after taking up the work in the county, as part of a program instituted by the State board of public welfare, the county superintendent of welfare made a census of crippled children in the county, locating 20 of them. She arranged for all these to be examined at the clinics of the State department of health,

taking 18 at one time to a clinic in Raleigh. The 16 who could benefit by the treatment were cared for at the State orthopedic hospital. Two other crippled children have been located since, and these also have been treated at the orthopedic hospital.

The superintendent reported that in the county there were almost no blind persons except a few who were very old. One blind baby had come to her attention, but his blindness was due to some other trouble than venereal disease. Two deaf children had come to her attention; one of them had been placed in a State school, the other in a private school at private expense.

Outdoor relief.

The county commissioners spent an average of \$130 a month for the relief of poor persons in their homes, known locally as the "outside list." The prevailing practice was to continue the relief indefinitely to persons once put on the list. A case was mentioned of a man who 22 years ago was thought to be dying. He was put on the list for \$1 a month, which has been paid to him ever since. The superintendent of public welfare is revising these poor lists gradually and increasing the amounts given to needy families, but the county commissioners have been loath to allow more than \$10 a month to any one family. In some instances the superintendent has supplemented the amount given by the commissioners from funds raised privately.

Private relief.

The superintendent had at her disposal a sum amounting to about \$500 a year, which was contributed by benevolent individuals for the relief of families coming to her attention for whom she could not provide adequately from the public funds of the county. Another special relief fund was created during the summer of 1924 by one of the wealthy men of the city, who dedicated to this purpose the money paid on 50-year bonds issued in connection with the sale of his private golf links to a local country club. A committee of five received the money, amounting to about \$750 a year, and spent it for relief purposes through the county superintendent of public welfare.

The law against solicitation of funds without a license from the State board of public welfare has been enforced by the superintendent of public welfare. (Only the Confederate veterans, the Salvation Army, and blind persons were permitted to solicit aid without a license.) Promiscuous begging by resident and nonresident solicitors had been eliminated.

Promotion of school attendance, and activity in regard to child labor.

Much of the superintendent's time (approximately one-third) was devoted to children reported as absent from school. Until the appointment of county superintendents of welfare no particular provision was made for securing school attendance. The superintendent of schools, or someone designated by him, did what little was done in the way of eliminating unnecessary absences. Each week the superintendent of welfare receives from each school a list of children who have been absent for an unusual reason. About 400 cases a year were investigated. The attendance record is much better in some districts than in others. The superintendent mentioned one school district from which, when she began her work, she received a list of 12 or 15 absent pupils each week. From the new consolidated school of this township not more than one or two a week were reported, and sometimes one or two weeks would pass without the noting of any absences. Work with negro children quite largely devolved upon the negro superintendent of schools. Both the white and the negro schools had improved materially, and further plans for the building and equipping of consolidated schools were under way. The superintendent of welfare felt sure that no child, white or negro, in the county was out of school solely on account of poverty. Clothing, shoes, and books were furnished when necessary. The superintendent of schools believed that the superintendent of public welfare should have an assistant who could give full time to school attendance during the sessions of the school.

The superintendent of welfare reported that in regard to child labor the superintendents of the mills cooperated with her and that in her opinion no children were employed illegally in the mills. She was issuing about 70 age certificates a year, mostly for work during the summer vacation.

The county home and the road camp.

One of the duties devolving upon the superintendent of welfare was overseeing the care of the old people in the county home. She found them miserably

housed in cabins on a farm distant from the city. As the result of her activity and planning a new, well-appointed institution was built on property near the city, and the 16 old people were moved to this "county hospital," as the new institution is designated.

The superintendent of welfare was also active and influential in improving the county road camp, to which short-time prisoners are sentenced. It is now considered one of the best in the State.

County health work.

In North Carolina, as elsewhere, sickness is one of the chief causes of distress. This county gives an interesting picture of the way county programs of health and welfare can be coordinated. The superintendent of health and the superintendent of public welfare occupied adjoining offices in the courthouse, and they worked together on many problems coming originally to the attention of one or the other. Although the county is one of the smaller ones and not required by law to employ a full-time health officer, it had accepted the working program of the State board of health, and employed not only a full-time superintendent of health but a full-time dentist as well. It was therefore very easy for the superintendent of welfare to obtain medical examinations and dental service for children in whom she was interested. The superintendent of welfare was active in directing to the clinics held by the superintendent of health any persons who would benefit thereby. Particularly was this the case in regard to the tonsil and adenoid clinics which were held each year. When in the course of his medical examinations of school children the superintendent of health found children who apparently needed some form of social service, he reported them to the superintendent of public welfare. The county dentist was authorized to treat free any child under the age of 12 in the county, and this service was very generally used. Children came to the dentist's office singly or were brought in groups, frequently in a school bus.

Provision for recreation.

The superintendent of public welfare believed that recreation is an important part of the community program, and she encouraged the development of community recreation. A large plot of ground having a beautiful wooded glen with a stream and waterfalls had been given to the community for a camp site. A bathing pool has been developed and a road built into the park. Any party properly organized and supervised was permitted to camp free of cost on this property. The secretary of the local Young Men's Christian Association and his wife were in charge of the camp in 1924 and lived there during the entire summer season. The King's Daughters were maintaining at the edge of the city an attractive park of 8 acres, in which was a swimming pool for small children and other playground equipment.

It can easily be seen that the superintendent of public welfare in this county was a very busy person with many interests. A single individual working in even so small a county could not adequately meet the opportunities presented for improving social conditions. For an adequate program of child care the general system would not need to be modified, but it should be developed by giving to the superintendent an adequate number of assistants.

Illustrative stories.

The following cases, picked almost at random, illustrate the case work which the superintendent of public welfare has done:

Aid to crippled children.—A 12-year-old boy, one of eight children in a family of little means, ran a nail into his foot when he was 5 years old and had blood poisoning. He had received treatment from time to time and finally part of the bone was removed. At one time amputation was thought necessary, but the child was too ill to permit operating. Then a turn for the better came and he recovered, but he had been using crutches for seven years when he was discovered by the superintendent of welfare. He was sent to the State orthopedic hospital, which he left wearing a brace but walking without crutches.

A 10-year-old girl had a tuberculous knee, which had troubled her since she was 3 years old. The mother—a widow—supported this child, two other children, and her aged mother by working in the mills. The girl having the affected knee was using crutches when the superintendent found her, but after treatment at the State orthopedic hospital was able to discard the crutches. Although her knee still is somewhat stiff this scarcely retards her movements.

Child placing.—A barber and his wife living in a plain but comfortable home lost their only child and were anxious to adopt a girl baby to take her place.

The superintendent, having no child needing a home, arranged with the North Carolina Children's Home Society for a placement, sending a description of the home, with assurance that it was a good place for a child. A 16-month-old girl was placed in the home. The superintendent occasionally visits the child, now about 5 years old, who is adored by the parents, and is kept clean and well dressed. The home impressed the representative of the United States Children's Bureau as exceedingly plain, almost bare; but she was assured that these people not only would give the child the love and devotion which was apparent but could provide for an education through high school or even through college. This was stated to be as poor a home as had been used for a child.

Three attractive little negro girls were deserted by their mother. With the help of neighbors their father cared for them until he was sent to prison for boot-legging. The superintendent placed these three children separately in three homes close together, so that they saw each other almost daily. At the time of the visit of the agent from the United States Children's Bureau the smallest girl, 5 years old, had been turned back by the family which first took her, because so young a child required more looking after than they had expected. She had been placed temporarily in the home with her oldest sister. The third girl was in the home of a married son of the couple who had the two others.

No better homes could have been found. Both the older man and woman were honest and reliable, with the best characteristics of their race. The man was a carpenter and exhibited an ornate mantelpiece extending from floor to ceiling which he had made entirely by hand—a fine piece of old-fashioned cabinetwork.

This couple had raised nine children of their own, and all were doing well, but the woman said it "just seemed I am bound to have a child in the house." The superintendent of public welfare was not hurrying to find another home for the smallest girl, hoping that eventually she would be kept by these good people. The home of the married son, in which the other child was placed, was equally satisfactory.

Aid to a mother in her own home.—A man died of pneumonia following influenza, leaving a wife and six children ranging in age from 3 months to 8 years. He had been a self-respecting, hard-working tenant farmer, and although they had made a living from the crops there were no savings. The family assets, after the hospital charges and funeral expenses had been paid, were a few pieces of household furniture and one cow. Neighbors brought the story to the superintendent of public welfare, asking her to help get these children admitted to an orphan asylum. They had advised the widowed mother to sell the cow, for which she could get \$100; but when that money was used up there would be nothing to do but send the children to an institution. The county welfare worker hastened to the home of the widow and found that she was an intelligent and courageous woman, who had finished the eighth grade in school. The social worker looked at the attractive children and told the mother some way would be found to keep them with her. She also told the mother to let no one persuade her to part with the cow, as the milk would go a long way toward keeping the children from starving.

Next the woman's father was visited. He owned more land than he could work but was in ill health and had a number of little children by a second wife. He could neither take this daughter's family into his home nor raise sufficient crops to feed them. However, there was on his land an old log cabin, into which his daughter moved. Afraid to stay alone, she persuaded a semiinvalid sister to live with her. The father furnished wood, some seed, and horses for plowing; and he could give corn meal and a bit of other food till a crop could be raised.

The welfare worker had all the children examined by the county health officer, interested a Sunday-school class in a church of the denomination of the family in making clothing for the children, and obtained from the county commissioners an order for \$7.50 a month for the mother. A crop of tobacco was planted and a garden. A supply of vegetables was raised for both summer and winter, and vegetables were dried and canned.

Then the State passed its mothers' allowance act, and the \$7.50 allowed by the county was matched by the State; so the mother received \$15 each month to aid her in supporting her children. (The welfare worker wished she could make it \$20.)

The grandfather, having made a good crop last year, built for his daughter and her family a modest cottage, where they are much more comfortable. They had 150 chickens, which gave promise of later income. Cotton and peanuts were planted, also a kitchen garden and sunflowers for the chickens. Last year's

tobacco crop netted the family \$200 in cash. The cow was still the family standby. The children were doing well, the older ones attending Sunday school and day school. That their health was being looked after is indicated by the fact that two of them were listed for adenoid operations at the next clinic to be held by the county health officer. Although the family were still poor and had been having a hard struggle since the death of the husband and father three years before, they were happy because they had been kept together through the resourceful help of the county superintendent of public welfare.

Delinquency.—An 11-year-old boy lived with his father—a tenant farmer—and his stepmother. When he was playing one evening with his little half-sister his ungovernable temper was aroused. Seizing a stick of wood he struck the little girl on the back of the head, killing her instantly. The neighborhood was aroused, and relatives of the mother of the dead child were so violent that the little boy was thought to be in danger of bodily harm. The sheriff therefore took him to the county seat, holding him in jail for protection. Care was taken that he should not see nor hear the few prisoners who were held there at the time.

The superintendent of welfare began to make inquiry. She learned at each of the farms on which his father had previously worked that the boy had been known to have violent tantrums. He showed no remorse and indeed no appreciation of the gravity of his situation, his only comment being that "he did not mean to kill her." The superintendent of welfare found the boy's reactions to the situation sufficiently unnatural to suggest subnormal mentality. A psychiatric examination was arranged for, and this boy of 11 proved to have the judgment and control of a child of 5. As the institution for the feeble-minded was full, and as this lad seemed capable of being trained to usefulness if properly directed and supervised, he was sent to the Jackson training school, where he has given no trouble and has greatly improved.

Children of illegitimate birth.—An unmarried mother had surrendered her child, a girl, at the time of birth of a second child. The father of this child had been brought to court to compel support, but very little money was collected. A child-placing society placed the little girl in a foster home, and the mother with her infant moved to a near-by county and after a time married a good, hard-working, reliable young man. The superintendent of welfare visited the newly established home as soon as she heard of the marriage. She found that the woman had told her husband about both children. The man was generous and fine in his attitude, and both he and his wife were anxious to get possession of the older child who now was 3 or 4 years old. The family with whom the child-placing society had placed this little girl refused to give her up, but the superintendent was eager to reunite the mother and daughter and expected to talk with the foster parents concerning the matter.

COUNTY NO. 2

The second county visited by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau is an attractive agricultural community with an area of about 600 square miles and a total population of more than 45,000, almost one-half of whom are negroes. There were hardly more than 100 persons of foreign birth in the county. The largest center of population was the county seat, with a population of about 6,000. The town next in size had a population of about 1,700. In the county were a small factory and a knitting mill, each of which employed about 25 white operatives. There were three or four other mills and another factory, which employed negro labor. A few men in the county were occupied from the middle of March to the middle of May in fishing with seines in the river. Aside from these minor industries the county was entirely agricultural. Potatoes and other vegetables were being produced increasingly, and chickens were raised in marketable quantities. Some 30,000 bales of cotton were produced yearly. The leading crop of the county, however, was tobacco, in the raising and shipping of which the majority of the people of the county were engaged.

In the mill districts the houses owned by the mills were in various states of repair, but they rented almost uniformly for 90 cents per room per month. A mill school was maintained with one public-school teacher who taught the first three or four grades, the older children going to the regular city schools. The mill people move in and out of the county, and it was said that not 30 per cent of the families in the mill section had been there three years before. This continual movement of the population was doubtless due largely to the low wages paid by these mills. The average was reported to be \$8 to \$10 a week.

The northern part of the county was planting an ever-increasing acreage of potatoes. In June, 1924, large quantities were being gathered for shipment North. As cotton was planted between the potato rows for a later harvest the farmers were getting double returns from their land. There were many tenant farmers in the county who moved from farm to farm; 10 to 20 per cent were said to move each year. Sometimes they made a good deal of money and occasionally they were cheated out of their just part of the crops. The ground is rich, level, and easily worked, and it was stated that anyone could make a living on the land. An intelligent, well-to-do farmer about 55 years old, who was born in the county and had always lived near his present farm, gave an interesting picture of improved conditions which typified the recent progress in the county. In his youth school had been held in a little cabin for two months only in midsummer between planting time and harvest time. In the winter the roads were so bad that no one could have got to school. But his children were attending school for a nine-month period each year, being transported in an automobile bus over excellent roads to an eight-room modern school building, which contained a large recreation hall for community use. Improved farm methods were helping to make all this possible.

The county superintendent of public welfare and board of child welfare.

Until October, 1920, this county employed a part-time superintendent of public welfare, paying \$1,000 a year to a young lawyer who was able to give little time to the work. The revised law of 1919 required each county with a population of more than 32,000 to employ a full-time superintendent. The incumbent appointed in October, 1920, on a full-time basis is one of the few superintendents of public welfare that have been appointed from outside the county they are to serve. Upon assuming the duties he soon won the confidence of the people. Earnest, honest, kindly, and with substantial common sense, he has been successful as a community leader and organizer and has developed a fair standard of social case work, though he had no previous training or experience in social case work. Among his many duties he seemed to find of most interest, perhaps, the promotion of school attendance and the obtaining of medical and surgical treatment for children in need of it and his work was effective in both lines.

The superintendent had done a substantial amount of effective work along many lines, and the children of the county had been immensely benefited through his efforts. He received requests for assistance from every direction, although most of the difficulties affecting children have been discovered primarily through his connection with the schools. During the school session most of his time was given to work with children who were reported as absent from school for various reasons. He estimated that at least one-half of his time was given directly to work with children, while his other activities, dealing principally with families, concerned children in only a slightly less degree. Although the mill people were said to be "the sorriest lot of folks in the county," the superintendent was having comparatively few calls for assistance from them. He believed this to be due to the fact that they moved about so constantly.

By agreement with the board of county commissioners the county board of education fixed the budget for the welfare department, and the county commissioners made the necessary appropriation to cover one-half of the expenses. The other half of the expenses was to be met from the county education fund. The budget included besides the salary of the superintendent a monthly allowance of \$50 for expenses (including the operation and repairs of a car which was owned by the county) and a salary of a half-time stenographer, the other half of whose time was given to the farm agent.

The superintendent has organized what he calls an indigent hospital fund. Twenty-one organizations and churches (15 white and 5 negro) contributed monthly sums to this fund, which amounted in June, 1924, to \$85 a month. The fund was being handled by a committee composed of 1 representative from each of the 21 organizations. The superintendent of welfare was secretary of the committee.

The work of the superintendent was praised and indorsed by nearly all the other officials of the county interviewed by the representative of the United States Children's Bureau. The chairman of the board of county commissioners, a physician of influence, stated that while some few people had expressed opposition to the work, there had been no organized or widespread criticism of it; the board of county commissioners was glad to have some one to whom it could turn over all the welfare matters, and who could give them proper consideration, and considered the present superintendent exactly the right man for the place and relied on his judgment; that if the office of the superintendent of welfare

were not mandatory by law the county commissioners would still retain it. The negro superintendent of negro schools strongly indorsed the work of the superintendent of public welfare, saying that he had rendered most valuable service to the negro children, that he was prompt and efficient, that he had done much to increase the regular attendance in the negro schools, and that the welfare work was of great advantage to the negro schools and to all the negro children of the community.

While the chairman of the board of public welfare said that the board did little except to indorse the recommendations of the superintendent, the superintendent dwelt on the usefulness of the board. He stated that in his judgment his work would be less secure without the backing of the board. He believed that the usefulness of the board was due to its personnel, each member being a person of standing and wide influence in the community. Any recommendation made by members of the board necessarily received serious consideration by the board of county commissioners, since they could influence public opinion at any time an issue was at stake.

Assistance to the juvenile court.

The clerk of the court is judge of the children's court. In this county he was not a lawyer and had held the office for four years. While he had but limited academic training he was a man of shrewd sense. He was kindly and desired to do the right thing for children. He apparently relied on the county superintendent of public welfare for guidance, although he did not hesitate to act on his own initiative. Probation was on an informal basis but was used in many cases, the local superintendent of welfare looking after such children and such families as needed advice or oversight.

Care of dependent and physically handicapped children.

In this county, as elsewhere, the majority of destitute children who needed to be cared for away from their families either were placed in other families known to the superintendent of welfare or were sent to one of the privately supported and managed orphanages of the State. The superintendent held that if a family is so "shiftless" that it can not give the children something to eat or clothe them some other home should be found for them. Such children he took under his care either with or without court action, making provision for them—usually in other family homes. Help in the building up of the family generally was not contemplated in such cases. With his many other duties, intensive rehabilitation efforts were practically impossible for the superintendent, even when their desirability was recognized. In very few cases were the county commissioners asked to pay for the care and support of children. Occasionally when the child was under court order, but not otherwise, they were asked to furnish clothing or other necessities. Whatever was needed for the children usually was secured from private sources. The superintendent of welfare collected and distributed a good deal of clothing to families known to him, and he procured school shoes as well as schoolbooks when needed.

The superintendent did much rather casual child placing. As probably would be the case when such efforts were first undertaken in new territory, some high-grade families have applied, or have been willing, to take children into their homes. There was also an evident readiness on the part of relatives and neighbors to take in any child that was thrown upon the world.

The negro families usually were required by the superintendent of public welfare to furnish a \$50 bond for the faithful performance of their duty to children taken into their homes. No such bond was required from white families.

With so little method in the placements, a superficial survey revealed surprisingly good results.

The superintendent was interested in securing treatment and appliances for crippled children. About one crippled child a month had been sent to the State orthopedic hospital, as many as five children from this county having been in the hospital at one time. Special funds also had paid for the treatment of some children in hospitals, and the superintendent had made arrangements for several handicapped adults to receive the benefits of the rehabilitation training furnished by the State.

Outdoor relief and mothers' allowances.

The superintendent of welfare was gradually revising the list of persons receiving outdoor relief. The county commissioners controlled the granting of such relief, but the superintendent recommended changes in the list every few months. Adequate support through this channel had not been contemplated heretofore,

but the amount given to families was being increased gradually. One report submitted by the superintendent to the county commissioners in June, 1924, showed a list of 76 persons receiving outside relief from the county. The amounts granted ranged from \$1 to \$12 a month, the average being \$2.55 a month. Twelve of the 76 persons were receiving \$5 or more, and two \$8 or more, a month. The superintendent's report indicated seven on the list who were dead or whose whereabouts was unknown. He was recommending an increase for six families, the adding of eight to the list, and the transfer of two to the county home. According to his statement persons on the list as a rule were receiving just a little spending money to buy tobacco and snuff.

The county has accepted the State's 50-50 plan of mothers' aid. In June, 1924, three families were receiving such assistance, all having been visited and approved by the State board of public welfare.

Promotion of school attendance and activity in regard to child labor.

This county was rapidly consolidating its schools, both white and negro. There were eight consolidated white schools in the county in the fall of 1924. Here, as elsewhere, it was stated that the consolidation of schools had reduced nonattendance 50 per cent and that a larger number of pupils over the age of 14 remained in school than heretofore. The judge of the children's court and the superintendent of welfare were using their influence to keep in school, or return to school, children over the age of 14. By court order certain 16 and 17 year old boys and girls had been returned to the school, taking up sixth-grade and seventh-grade work.

The school authorities expressed their approval of having the attendance work under the superintendent of welfare. At present only unexcused absences were reported to him. Both the school authorities and the superintendent of welfare felt that children were excused too readily for work. During the planting season large numbers of absences for this reason appeared on all school reports. One school report examined in June, 1924, showed 20 per cent of the pupils absent during one week. The superintendent of welfare had no way of knowing whether he would approve of the "excused" absences or not. Parents were prosecuted for keeping children from school only when they were persistent and willful offenders. During his first year in the county the superintendent prosecuted 72 cases, which had a wholesome effect. His second year he had had to take parents into court only seven times.

Little time of the superintendent was required in connection with issuing work permits to children. Not more than a dozen permits had been issued in a year.

Supervision of children on parole from State institutions.

The county superintendent of public welfare received from the State training school notice of children from the county who were to be discharged. Usually he was given the opportunity of looking into the circumstances of the family of the child and reporting back to the institution before the child was returned to the county. As the State schools developed the system of paroling children to families other than their own the superintendent was expecting to supervise any families within his county into which children were paroled. He was also notified by the State hospital for the insane when patients were paroled to his county. Such patients could reenter the hospital without a new commitment within a certain period, but unless the hospital heard something about the patient before the end of the period, he was automatically discharged. The superintendent of welfare occasionally acted as probation officer in special cases coming before the superior court of the county. Two men were on probation to him at the time of the visit to the county.

The county home and the road camps.

Although the county home presented a rather attractive appearance from the outside, it was a forlorn place within. White and negro inmates were in different wings of the building, but there was no separation of the sexes. One 12-year-old boy was in the institution, having been sent there to look after his father, who was helpless from dropsy. This child had been taken from school and sent to the institution with his father because no nursing service was available. The almshouse population has averaged from 10 to 12 each year. The per capita cost for the year 1923 was more than \$95 a month.

The road camps were in marked contrast to those of county No. 1. The superintendent of welfare had been designated superintendent and general manager of the county jail by the board of county commissioners, and he had brought

about material improvements in that institution, but he had not as yet effected much improvement in the road camps.

County health work and provision for recreation.

The county employed a full-time superintendent of health, who was the medical inspector of the schools. However, his time was so taken up with the other duties of his office that the routine school inspection usually was left to the school-teacher or the county nurse. Compulsory vaccination against smallpox had recently been ordered enforced by the county, and the superintendent of welfare and the superintendent of health were cooperating in enforcing the order. The schools were excluding pupils for nonvaccination, notifying the superintendent of public welfare at once. He promptly threatened the parents with prosecutions for keeping the children from school, and usually prompt vaccination would follow. Venereal disease, tuberculosis, and throat and dental clinics had been held in the county, and the superintendent of welfare was active in directing both children and adults to suitable clinics. The superintendent of welfare in this county was particularly alert to obtain proper medical treatment for persons coming under his care. The American Red Cross had set aside \$600 a year as a corrective health fund, and the King's Daughters had paid hospital bills for special cases. This was in addition to the indigent hospital fund that has been mentioned on page 86.

The superintendent of welfare had encouraged the men's clubs in their interest in athletics for children. A successful spring athletic meet of all white school children in the county had been held.

Illustrative stories.

The following case stories illustrate the activities of the superintendent in the case-work field:

Medical aid.—The parents of a boy who was extremely ill of pleuropneumonia refused to have a doctor because they did not believe in medical treatment. The health officer was called in by neighbors. He found pus collecting and believed that only an operation would save the life of the child. The superintendent of welfare was sent for. He brought the father before the judge on a charge of criminal neglect of the health of the child and the endangering of his life. Under such pressure the consent of the parents was obtained, and the child was removed to the hospital. A successful operation was performed, and the parents paid the hospital bill.

A seriously crippled negro boy, with legs badly twisted and one arm paralyzed, was somewhat musical. He played the guitar and the organ, pumping the latter by moving the toes of one foot on the pedal. The superintendent was planning to arrange for him to be examined by the orthopedist from the State hospital when he next visited the county. In conversation with the mother the superintendent seemed to approve of her plan to bring this pathetic creature to town to play on the streets for pennies. It is to be hoped he realized she was not likely to be able to do this.

Mothers' aid.—A widow with five children was being helped by various groups. The oldest, a boy of 15, was at work, the others were girls of 14, 11, 8, and 6 at the time of the visit. The parents had been industrious and self-supporting, but they had not much ahead when the father developed cancer of the stomach. Sixty dollars in a building and loan company alone remained at the time of his death.

There were three daughters by a former marriage, all married, with growing families of young children, and unable to help. There was also a brother.

One interested woman had given \$10, and churches took up an occasional collection for this family. The brother's church gave a little help. One or two ministers then asked the superintendent of welfare to help. He found a possible family income from scattering sources of \$7 a month while expenses were running about \$18.50 a month, and still the family obviously was not getting what it required. A pension of \$25 a month was arranged for with the approval of the State board of public welfare, the State and the county each paying half. A good stove and some clothing were also obtained for the woman.

The son was in bad health at the time the pension was arranged for, but his health later improved. He was working regularly when visited by the agent of the United States Children's Bureau, and contributed \$8 a month toward the rent. The mother had ceased to worry from day to day about how she could possibly care for the children, her self-respect had been restored, and she said she was getting along "right well."

Outdoor relief.—Twelve dollars a month was given from the poor fund to a family consisting of a man and wife, both invalids, and two grown daughters—one feeble-minded, the other normal—who lived on a farm. With this help the family got along. The feeble-minded girl could work under her sister's direction, and together they "made a crop" to help out. This is the type of family which formerly received from \$1 to \$3 a month from the commissioners.

Promotion of school attendance.—A man who had nine children sent those of school age to school very irregularly or not at all. The superintendent went to see him since he paid no attention to a written warning. After a personal talk and an explanation of the penalty for not sending them the five children attended "200 per cent more of the time."

One girl from a poor family was kept in school in the city for three years, living with a family selected by the superintendent of welfare. Later she was placed in a hospital for training as a nurse and was doing well.

Child placing.—A boy of 13 was found by the police at the railroad station. He had been born in the county and had run away from an abusive father and stepmother now living in another county. The superintendent took him at once to a man who had said he would take a boy. The circumstances were looked into with the assistance of the superintendent of welfare in the near-by county, who reported that the father had run away to escape punishment for a crime against a little girl. This placement seemed an excellent one; the boy was happy, the man liked him and sent him to school regularly.

A girl of 12, who had attended school only five days the previous year, came to visit an aunt in the city. The superintendent of public welfare got the parents' consent to provide a place for her to stay and go to school. He placed her in a good home near the 12-teacher consolidated school, which she was attending regularly.

A boy over 16 years of age who two years before had run away from a "mean" father in another county, was brought to the superintendent of welfare. He was placed with a woman who was running a small hotel in one of the attractive villages of the county. At the time of placement the boy could not do fourth-grade work, since he had not been able to attend school regularly. He was nearly 19 at the time this study was made and had finished the seventh grade. He was paid \$16 a month wages during the winter, and in June, when there was not so much business, he was paid \$12 with his board, lodging, laundry, and some clothing. He had saved \$60. He was contented and happy, as was the woman who is both his foster mother and employer. His health had improved, and he was most attractive, reliable, and ambitious.

Maternity care and unmarried mothers.—While the agent of the United States Children's Bureau was in the office of the county superintendent of welfare a white man of rather rough appearance came to tell of a negro girl having no "folks," who was pregnant. She had been turned out of the place where she was staying and was now with a well-known negro midwife who, he said, could not keep her.

The superintendent and the agent of the United States Children's Bureau went to see the girl, who, though undersized, was 17 years old. She was straightforward and far from stupid. She gave the name of the man who was responsible—a young man whose wife was not living with him.

The interesting old midwife was sheltering also another pregnant girl only 14 or 15 years old. The old husband of the midwife was ill with heart and kidney trouble. A married daughter and her husband lived with them.

Some neighbors were helping "chop cotton" (thinning it out by chopping off some of the plants with a hoe) and an impromptu day nursery was being conducted in one room. The 17-year-old girl was in charge, and a boy of about 11 was helping with the seven small children, three of whom were babies.

After questioning the group the superintendent went away, telling them to say nothing of his visit, as the men might abscond if they should hear of it. His plan was to bring a justice of the peace to take the sworn statements of both girls, immediately after which both of the responsible men were to be arrested.

The midwife desired to keep the 17-year-old girl with her but wished something could be collected from the responsible man so she could pay a doctor if one were needed at the delivery.

The superintendent stated he usually settled with the "colored fellows" for \$50 or \$60. The State law fixes \$200 as the maximum which can be collected. He said that often he could not collect that much without court order, and sufficient evidence was difficult to collect.

The superintendent told of a case in which two homeless negro girls were taken in by a couple who had a nearly grown boy, who became responsible for the pregnancy of one of the girls. The foster parents turned the girl out. The boy left the county but was brought back through the efforts of the superintendent, who collected \$60 from the boy's parents. The girl was placed in another family.

Prosecutions obtained.

The superintendent of public welfare stated that he had a number of cases involving offenses against children, as many as five a month. In these cases he secured prosecutions of the offenders.

COUNTY NO. 3

The third county visited is one of the largest in the State, having a population of more than 79,000, more than one-fifth of whom were negroes. It covers nearly 700 square miles and contains two cities. The county seat had a population of about 20,000 and the second city in size about 15,000. Both cities recently had incorporated outlying mill districts, which brought the population of the first to something like 43,000, and of the second to 23,000. This county is an unusually rich one. Not only are the cities the centers of large industries and of business interests, but the county produces a wide range of crops, such as grain, corn, hay, and garden truck. Stock raising and dairying are increasing. Both beef and pork are raised, mostly for home consumption. Cotton is being raised in increasing quantities, and much tobacco. No in-season crops are imported into the county.

There were almost no white tenant farmers in the county, and many of the negro farmers own their own land. There are nine large insurance companies with headquarters for the South in the county seat, many mills, and numerous furniture factories. The mills paid better wages than in the other counties visited, and the mill people were said to be superior to those working in certain other mill districts of the State. The larger mills kept up mill schools, mill houses, mill churches, and the like, in paternalistic fashion. Houses in the mill districts of the county seat rented for \$4 a month for four rooms. Wages ran from \$8 to \$18 a week; a certain mill occasionally paid as much as \$40 or \$45 a week.

In the welfare field this county presented a complicated administrative situation and clearly illustrated the greater difficulty of organizing a county which contains one or more large cities. In the county seat there was a city board of public welfare, a private organization financed through a community chest. In the smaller city there were a white and a negro board of public welfare, both appointed by the city council. Until the mandatory act of 1919 the board of county commissioners had failed to appoint a county superintendent of public welfare. When the mandatory act was passed the principal candidates for the position were a deputy sheriff and a policeman. The State board of public welfare tried to have the superintendent of schools appointed as full-time superintendent of public welfare. The board of county commissioners and the county board of education, however, selected for appointment the executive secretary of the local relief agency, which had recently adopted the name "city board of public welfare." It was arranged that she should continue as the executive officer of the private organization and should become the county superintendent of public welfare, supervising the work of such assistants as should be provided by either agency.

There seems little doubt that the total amount of service to children rendered in this county was as great as could be expected from the number of persons employed. The pressure and diversity of duties created a situation in which effective organization of the staff and the selection of those tasks of the widest social significance was difficult, if not impossible.

The staff for welfare work.

In the summer of 1924 the staff was as follows: A county superintendent of public welfare, one-half of whose salary was paid by the board of county commissioners and one-half by the board of education; two assistants, paid by the city board of public welfare through the community chest; a negro city probation officer appointed by the juvenile court and paid by the city; a city attendance officer paid by the city board of education. All of these except the superintendent of public welfare were working exclusively in the county seat. In the

smaller city was a probation officer, who was also in charge of issuing working certificates and in charge of school-attendance work within the city. One-half of her salary was paid by the city board of education and board of public welfare to her as probation officer, and one-half was paid by the county board of commissioners and county board of education for her assistance to the county superintendent of welfare. An additional white probation officer for the county seat was soon to be appointed, whose salary was to be paid by the city council. In the smaller city there was a visiting nurse who was doing a great deal of family-welfare work and who was paid by the city council. It was expected that the city would soon appropriate money for an assistant to this nurse, and whether such an assistant should be a nurse or a social worker was being discussed. The various agents in the field were supported by and therefore responsible to two public and four private agencies. All of them were expected to work under the general direction of the superintendent of public welfare, but with so diversified a group of workers appointed by the various bodies, public and private, the distribution and supervision of the work were difficult.

The county superintendent of public welfare and board of public welfare.

The superintendent of welfare after graduation from a small church college had trained for the mission field. She married and after the death of her husband became the executive secretary of the private organization, which later adopted the name "city board of public welfare." She had been in social work in the county for 11 years. One of the assistants was a graduate of Goucher College, who had taken summer courses at Columbia University. A second member of the staff was a graduate of the North Carolina College for Women, who in 1924 took a summer course at the New York School of Social Work.

The superintendent of public welfare, besides directing the work of the various field agents, was attempting personally to take care of the attendance work and other forms of case work in the county outside the two cities.

On member of the staff in the county seat was delegated to take charge of certificates of age and working certificates. Such certificates were issued during the year to about 300 children. The other general assistant of the superintendent of public welfare was assigned to do general family case work in the county seat. The hard-working staff was entirely inadequate to the situation. The superintendent estimated that to cover the territory suitably she would need 12 field workers, as follows: At least three court workers (one for each city and one for the county outside the cities); four attendance officers (two for the county seat, one for the second largest city, and one for the county outside the two cities); one general relief agent; two child-labor workers (one for each city with the remainder of the county divided between these two); and two negro assistants for general work among the negroes. In addition to this field staff the superintendent estimated that there should be at least five office workers. The superintendent was inclined to believe that if a field staff of such size were available it might be best to district the county, possibly the cities also, and have each worker do whatever was required within the allotted section—instead of having each worker cover larger territory but perform only specified duties therein.

The board of county commissioners were friendly to the superintendent of public welfare and reported that no other individual could have secured the good results which she had brought about. While members of the board of commissioners as individuals praised the county superintendent of welfare and said that she could have whatever she asked for, it was apparent that she did not feel that she could ask for adequate assistance or for greatly increased appropriations for poor relief.

The county board of public welfare had been active since its appointment in 1917. One of the first tasks it undertook was the improvement of conditions in the jail and the road camp. A bitter fight had been waged, which had secured some of the results desired. Two of the members of the board of welfare had recently resigned, feeling that the board of county commissioners had become so antagonistic to them that their usefulness was at an end. During the summer of 1924, the welfare board consisted of one woman, who had been a member since its organization and who was an influential and public-spirited citizen, and the two recently appointed members, who were young business men greatly interested in their duties as members of the board. One of the retiring members of the board of public welfare expressed his opinion that the welfare work would not assume its proper standing in the community nor be able to function satisfactorily until it was given a status in the county comparable to that of the county board of education, which was in a position to determine what the schools required

and what the school budget should be, and was given a status, instead of being merely representative of the State's interest in and obligation to the county administration.

Assistance to the juvenile court.

When the juvenile court law was first enacted the two cities each organized a separate children's court as the law required for cities of more than 10,000 population. Later the clerk of the superior court of the county took over the juvenile-court work of the county seat, as the law permitted, by agreement between the governing bodies of the county and the city. The smaller city, however, still maintained its separate court. The clerk of the court was not a lawyer, but it was recognized that he had acquired through experience a wide range of legal information. A middle-aged man with a sympathetic interest in children, he acknowledged that when he first undertook the work he did not see any good in it, but "soon became converted and am now strong for it." He said that one of his principal troubles was the lack of understanding on the part of the city policemen of what the court was for and the good that it could accomplish, many of them believing in the chain gang as the only punishment for either juvenile or adult offenders. The superintendent of welfare and the judge of the juvenile court were in the habit of talking over the various cases in an informal way, thus arriving at a decision as to the treatment for each child. The spirit of cooperation and the genuine interest of the judge in the welfare of the children were apparent.

Lack of time handicapped the superintendent of welfare in her work as probation officer. Children on probation were required to report in person weekly to the probation officer and were expected to bring with them written reports as to conduct (on cards printed for the purpose) from their parents, their school-teachers, and their Sunday-school teacher. In some cases daily report cards had been required. These were mailed by the parents or school-teacher to the superintendent of welfare.

The superintendent of welfare believed in cooperating with all other existing agencies and in avoiding all duplications so far as possible. She therefore made no attempt to place children in foster homes but referred all children requiring free-home placement to the North Carolina Children's Home Society.

Protection of unmarried mothers.

The superintendent of welfare had many unmarried mothers referred to her for counsel and assistance. She stated that she had handled about 18 such mothers during the previous year. She used a church maternity home in one of the cities, a Florence Crittenton home, and a Salvation Army rescue home in South Carolina. Prosecutions of the responsible men and boys were instituted, and confinement expenses were collected whenever possible. As the law fixed a maximum of \$200 as the amount which can be collected in such circumstances only a small amount had been collected each year from the men and boys prosecuted.

Outdoor relief and mothers' allowances.

To the superintendent of welfare had been delegated practically all the authority of the county commissioners in handling relief to the poor in their own homes. No definite appropriation was set aside for this purpose, but the bills presented by the superintendent of welfare were paid. The superintendent was gradually increasing the amount allowed to the beneficiaries and slowly but surely putting the poor list on a sounder basis according to the needs of each family. She hoped in time to make the relief given through this channel adequate and to establish it on the same satisfactory basis as the mothers' allowance fund.

The county had accepted the State plan for mothers' allowances, and seven families were given such assistance, the State paying one-half of each allowance. The highest amount paid to any one family was \$35 a month, the lowest \$25 a month. The superintendent of welfare stated that in all seven families the maximum amount permitted by the law according to the number of children had been granted. The superintendent considered it better to give adequate allowances to a few rather than to spread the available funds among a larger number of families.

Promotion of school attendance and activity in regard to child labor.

The school authorities in this county agreed that it was wise to have the attendance work done by the office of the superintendent of public welfare, although certain teachers complained that after reporting absences they heard

nothing from the welfare worker for a considerable time. In the opinion of the superintendent of welfare and of the school authorities the law should be changed to eliminate the possibility of absences for certain kinds of work in the homes. They stated that all too frequently children were kept at home to do the family washing or other household tasks and that the demands of farm work make heavy inroads on attendance. Parent-teacher associations, which had been organized in every consolidated school in the county, were rendering assistance to the superintendent of public welfare in this matter as well as in other directions. The schools were being consolidated rapidly throughout the county, and school attendance was increasing. Three times as many pupils graduated from the high school of the principal city in 1924 as in 1919. The superintendent of public welfare was clearly unable to cover all the work assigned to her, and in handling nonattendance cases in the county outside the two cities she had been driven to adopt the method of following up by correspondence. When notice was received of an absence from school one of three types of letters was sent to the parents—a printed letter, a form letter written in the office, or a personal letter written by the superintendent of welfare. It was evident that the pressure of other work absorbed the time of the staff so that constructive case work was not widely undertaken in nonattendance cases, particularly those outside the two cities.

It was claimed that the mills in this county were among the best in the State in regard to working conditions. A representative of the State child-welfare commission stated that the mills and factories of this district had cooperated satisfactorily in the enforcement of the child labor law. In June, 1924, just after the close of the school term, the time of one person in the office of the superintendent of public welfare was largely occupied with issuing work permits. The majority of the boys applying were already known, and few visits to the homes were made as part of the investigation. Children under 14 were required to turn in their work permits upon quitting each job, so that in many instances the applications were for reissuance for a new place of employment. A school certificate of age and grade, the written permission of the parents, and a physician's certificate were filed with each permit.

The county home and road camps.

Although the law permitted children to be cared for in the county homes very few except infants with their mothers had been placed there in recent years. A new county home costing about \$160,000 recently had been opened. The main building contains four wards, for male and female white and negro inmates. Persons of the two races are in separate wings of the building, but the sexes are not separated except at night. There is also a building for insane inmates. The State hospitals retained only such cases as were thought to be improvable, and the other county patients were confined in this building. Each patient was in a cell; most of them were poorly dressed and in their bare feet on the cement floors. The patients' food was served on enameled pans, which were handed to them through the gratings in the doors. Female prisoners were committed to the almshouses and performed the various services needed in the buildings. They were kept in locked quarters in the basement at night. One baby was in the institution with his mother at the time of the visit of the representative of the United States Children's Bureau. The superintendent of welfare said that this child would be taken from her shortly and turned over to the North Carolina Children's Home Society, which had placed the woman's older children.

Young boys occasionally were sent to the road gang and mingled with the more hardened offenders in the road camps. A new stockade building being erected was far from satisfactory to the superintendent of the camp, the county superintendent of public welfare, or the county board of public welfare. One member of the board of county commissioners had been in charge of the work, and to him had been left decisions as to plans and details of construction. While road camps are presumably used only for short-time prisoners, at least two men in the camp at the time of the visit of the representative of the United States Children's Bureau were serving 10-year sentences. One of these was feeble-minded and was serving a second sentence for sex offenses.

Supervision of children on parole from State institutions.

The superintendent of public welfare received notice before the discharge of children from the State training schools, but she could not visit them as promptly nor as regularly as she desired. So far as possible each child was visited, as were also the patients discharged from the State hospital for the insane.

County health work and provision for recreation.

The health work in this county had not been organized as satisfactorily as in the two other counties visited. During the summer of 1924 the county health officer had resigned, and county health activities were practically at a standstill. In the two cities the health work was on a much better basis, and hope was expressed that a full county health program soon would be adopted.

The home demonstration agent had encouraged recreation for the children of the county, and each year camping trips had been organized for all the boys and girls who had carried through projects under the direction of the farm agent or of the home demonstration agent.

Illustrative case stories.

Numerous stories were told illustrating the general ignorance of the families dealt with. The superintendent estimates that she knows of 15 feeble-minded persons needing State care. She believes other counties would show an equal number. She is unable to cope with the difficulties created by the circumstances of some of these feeble-minded persons. The following case stories illustrate various types of work done:

Protection of delinquent boys.—Three boys from this county had been found in a city in Virginia, and the probation officer there telephoned about them. One of the boys was 14 years old, so he alone was subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and the care of the superintendent of welfare; but the superintendent made a thorough study of the situation of all three boys and interviewed their relatives very carefully. The youngest boy was involved with one of the older ones in the theft of an automobile and in other offenses. One of the men in the courthouse offered to drive to Virginia for the boys. To the dismay of the superintendent he brought them home handcuffed. As he was unloading them from the automobile at the courthouse two of the lads broke away and ran, handcuffed as they were. They were located in their homes the next morning. They said they had run because the man had told them they would get two years on the road. The 14-year-old boy was sent to a State training school, as he had no chance at home. His father at the time was in the road gang on an 18-month sentence for selling whisky. It was said that this boy had continued the sales after his father's arrest. The mother, well dressed and chewing gum, said that she was too soft-hearted to do what the superintendent of welfare had to do. It was obvious that she took her son's difficulties all too lightly.

Protection of neglected girls.—The superintendent took a young and pretty girl from her crippled father, who supported himself by begging, and arranged to send her on a scholarship to a church industrial school in a near-by State. The child was thought to be in moral danger, and in any case the hovel provided by the crippled beggar was not suitable for her. The father was abusive and threatening, and he finally sought through habeas corpus proceedings to reclaim his child. When he failed to obtain possession of her he made his way to where she was, inspected the school, and was so well satisfied that he not only was glad to leave the girl there but wrote to the superintendent thanking her for what she had done. He found a job in the neighborhood of the school and worked there until he died a year or two later.

Such scholarships had been raised for four girls in this county by Sunday school classes. The schools to which they were sent are industrial schools operated by various churches. The pupils work in the schools, so that expenses are small, tuition and maintenance being as low as \$50 a year.

Obtaining milk for babies.—The superintendent has raised money in the primary departments of various Sunday schools to buy milk for undernourished babies. She did this by telling the story of a needy baby, sometimes having an infant brought to the Sunday school to make the lesson graphic. She explained to the children that the baby needed milk and asked that pennies for milk be put in a milk bottle which she had arranged as a bank. Sometimes the same baby was brought back later to show his improvement. The identity of the baby was not divulged, the superintendent stated, and she was careful to select one, usually an orphan, whose identity would not be discovered. She had raised considerable sums in this way.

Promotion of school attendance.—One woman protested against the interference of the superintendent in the matter of her children's school attendance, saying: "You didn't birth them and you ain't got nothin' to do with them." She further said she lived by the Bible and if she could be shown where the Bible said she had to send her children to school she would, otherwise she would not. After talking half an hour the superintendent attempted to serve a warrant, whereupon

she was promptly slapped in the face. When brought into court the woman was arraigned for assault as well as for neglecting to send the children to school, although the superintendent was opposed to having the former charge pressed. The woman offered to pay the superintendent something to atone for her offense. Finally she said to the court, "I'm sorry I slapped her, for she seems like a right decent sort of a woman." The superintendent thereupon asked permission to appear in behalf of the woman, and her appeal to the court resulted in suspension of the sentence if the children were kept in school. Thereafter attendance was quite regular, and the woman and the superintendent were good friends.

Supervision and protection of children in the home.—A girl under 16 years of age, whose mother was dead and whose father had deserted, had been living with an aunt who kept boarders. The father had come back and through a court order had been granted the custody of his daughter. Shortly afterwards he suspected that she was pregnant and turned to the superintendent of welfare for assistance. She made the necessary inquiry and secured a medical examination, which disproved the suspicion. The girl was left with the father under the supervision of the superintendent of welfare.

A childish girl of 14, the daughter of a woman who had stood well in the community and whose home at one time had been used as a temporary boarding home, was found to be pregnant. A 25-year-old man who boarded with the family was arrested and put in jail as the one responsible for her condition. The superintendent of welfare got from the mother a confession that she, a woman over 40, living with her second husband and her children, had had like relations with this young man for a considerable time and feared that if he went to trial he would divulge this situation. The superintendent concluded that the young man really had been seduced by the mother of the 14-year-old girl. His release on the day before the trial was brought about through the influence of the mother and he disappeared before any of the welfare workers knew he was at liberty. The superintendent assisted in providing care for the girl.



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05708 4988

